



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



Harvard Depository  
Brittle Book

CONTROVERSIAL  
PAPERS.

84

543c







J. B. A. Harvey.

# CONTROVERSIAL PAPERS.

BY

W. H. ANDERDON, M.A.,

*Priest of the Society of Jesus.*

1. *Is Ritualism Honest?*
2. *Is there Unity in the Church of Rome?*
3. *Answer to the Protestant Bishop of Manchester.*

---

LONDON :

BURNS AND OATES, PORTMAN STREET, W.

1878.

*Also :*

**AFTERNOONS WITH THE SAINTS.** Eighth Edition, 4s.

**THE CATHOLIC CRUSOE.** Seventh Edition. Crown 8vo. with seven  
Illustrations. Cloth, 4s.

*(For the rest, see back of cover.)*

# IS RITUALISM HONEST?

## THREE LECTURES

BY

W. H. ANDERDON, M.A.,

*Priest of the Society of Jesus.*

---

SECOND EDITION.

---

LONDON :  
BURNS AND OATES, PORTMAN STREET, W.

1877.

Digitized by Google

Anderson-Gund

25-42-9



- I. IS RITUALISM CONSONANT WITH HISTORY?**
- II. IS RITUALISM COMPATIBLE WITH FORMULARIES?**
- III. IS RITUALISM PROMOTED BY THE BISHOPS?**

684  
A543c

ANDOVER - HARVARD  
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY  
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

## LECTURE I.

### *Is Ritualism consonant with History?*

SOME feeling has been manifested regarding the title of the lectures I propose to give. It is thought to convey a reflection upon individuals. A correspondent, who assumes that he knows beforehand all that I am going to say, refers to a standard dictionary, which defines "Honest" to be: "Acting according or agreeably to promise, or engagement, or obligation, expressed or implied: faithful, trusty, or trustworthy; upright, virtuous; fair and open in dealings; open, frank." I could desire nothing more to my purpose. Not having previously consulted a dictionary, I am obliged for this definition. We will adopt and apply it, in the course of what is now to be said. I shall endeavour to show: First, if ritualism undertakes to represent the historic Church of England, and to continue the ecclesiastical system which we find under Edward and Elizabeth, it is not "faithful, trusty, or trustworthy." Secondly, so far as it claims to be an administration of the formularies to which its ministers are pledged by oath and subscription, it is not "according or agreeable to promise, engagement, and obligation, expressed or implied." Thirdly, if a fair proportion of what we hear is true of certain "economies" and subterfuges exercised by some of the clergy in dealing with their bishops, then the system, in its practical operation, is not "fair and open in dealings; open, frank." And these are the three divisions of our subject.

But the general title distinctly states what is here meant: "Is Ritualism honest?" The question is very distinct from another: "Can a ritualist be so?"

In this first part, I make no direct inquiry, and shall strive to avoid any judgment, as to personal honesty. We are concerned with the system, as it will be discussed by

some future historian: as Lingard or Hume might have discussed the Nonjurors. Individual souls we leave to the Judge of all. What amount of religious honesty may exist in persons detained within the trammels of a system which I hope to show you is in itself essentially dishonest, we dare not speculate. "Judge not, that ye be not judged." It is certainly harder to acquit the teachers than the taught: so far is clear. Ritualist clergymen are acquainted with history; they are familiar with the formularies of their Church; they are in contact—not always very willingly—with their bishops. How they can fail to perceive, under these three heads, the anomaly, amounting to dishonesty, of their position, is more than we can see. But I do not constitute myself even a puisne judge in that Court. And, as to the blind who are led by such blind guides, there is humility, though mistaken, in the position of a disciple, surrendering himself to the direction of another, whom he believes to be instructed and authoritative. It implies something of that self-mistrust and abnegation which, under right conditions, is a Christian grace. We must always pity, sometimes almost admire, such docile souls. They reason, as the insane are said to do, rightly, upon wrong premisses. And we would fain hope, even against hope, for inculpable ignorance in some, who now range themselves under the banner of a deadly misbelief, "until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in their hearts."

Then, again, I, for one, ought not to be unsympathising towards those who are really struggling out of darkness into light. Can I forget, though now more than a quarter of a century ago, the hopes and fears by which I have myself been agitated? I found myself in a Communion, with a growing dislike of its tone, its history, and (I must add) its living authorities. I found myself, in the same measure, drawn towards that true home, centre of hearts and minds, where nothing was national, sectional, narrow, cold, or ambiguous; where doctrine was clear as a trumpet-tone, and sympathy and healing soft as a mother's whisper to her sick child. In this very part of the country,\* within a few miles of Christchurch, when my own mind and opinions were forming in youth, I providentially met the man who,

\* The lectures were originally delivered at Bournemouth.

more than any other, carried on that special revival of religious thought and life which sent so many, myself by divine mercy among them, across the Rubicon ; or rather, through the Jordan into the Promised Land. John Henry Newman then spoke of organising the "Tracts for the Times ;" and those few days were a chief turning-point in my own life. I would not detain you with anything so personal, were it not to show that I am not likely to look with aversion, or even indifference, on any part of this present movement which may be consistent with genuineness, sincerity, earnest aspirations after something better. "Wisdom is justified of her children." The more these principles are adopted, at least in their best phase, the more will the disciples of ritualism seek truth where alone it is to be found. They ask for bread, and there is given to them a stone. What is the result? They are led, like the Jewish shepherds, to Bethlehem, "the house of Bread." This present agitation, like the Gorham case, and all similar cases, will result in the accession to God's Church of a certain number of earnest souls, known only to Himself. Hence, the more Ritualism agitates, the more it will cast out of the Anglican communion, and the more individuals will be ultimately saved. Ritualism stirs the waters, and we catch the fish. This may explain why we look upon all such movements with hope, with prayer, and at the same time with deep compassion. They have, it is true, their grotesque side, from which we endeavour to turn our thoughts, though it may sometimes irresistibly press in. Every man must be grotesque, who dresses up in other people's clothes, or tries to perform other people's habitual and official acts, or announces himself to be somebody he is not. But God forbid that any word should now escape me which might be interpreted into undue sarcasm, upon details which I must feel to be open to unlimited satire at every turn.

What, then, is here meant by *honesty*? I ask the question: "*Is Ritualism honest?*" You remember that Shakspeare makes a simple countrywoman ask: "Is poetry a true thing?" The one question may help to answer the other. Poetry is a most true thing within its own sphere ; out of that sphere, it is like a bird, or a fish, out of its

element. Nothing is more unpractical than a poetic view of life ; nothing more insufferable than poetical prose. So, ritual, not ritualism, is a most honest, congruous thing, where it is at home. It is only when you import it into a place foreign to it, and incongruous, that it becomes dishonest ; as poetry, under the like conditions, may become untrue. Thus, a chasuble is a sacrificial vestment, quite in place on the shoulders of a true sacrificing priest. But on a minister, whom the bishop that made him a minister had no intention of making a sacrificing priest in any true sense of the word, it is incongruous in the last degree : it is an untruth, and (in the sense I have explained) a dishonesty. Lights and flowers on a true altar are honest, and in place : on a communion table they are meaningless, and, when thus made to enforce a doctrine inadmissible where they stand, they are a sham. To stand before an altar, as making intercession for the sins of the people, is honest and congruous in a priest, whose office pledges him to do it. His ancestors in the faith have done it for centuries ; it is the principal function of his life, and interprets his very name. But to stand in an "eastward position" before a table, which is defined by authority to be, of necessity, "an honest moveable table," from which the idea of Sacrifice is excluded—this must ever be incongruous in a minister ; it contradicts all received traditions ; it is opposed to the wish of his bishop, it is not done when that bishop is present, but *is* done when he is away : and so (still in the above sense of the word) is dishonest. To stretch a rubric, to ignore a canon, to go against the plain sense of an article, to act contumaciously against the obligations one has taken, and against the living authority before whom one has taken them—if all this is honest, if it is genuine, conscientious dealing, then we shall have to go to school again, and learn our English language afresh.

True : there is a further sense of the word dishonest ; and I should not be faithful to my subject if I passed it altogether by. When the "Tracts for the Times" began to stir the country, forty years ago, people were not slow to accuse the clergy who adopted those principles, of eating the bread of the Establishment, while their teaching was opposed to its spirit. "Go out from among us," was their

cry, "you are not of us. Seek the true home where your opinions are acknowledged, and we will then call you honest men." So at Hatcham; the other day, the cry of the mob was: "Change here for Rome." There is a deep-seated and most just feeling against a man's continuing to occupy a position, especially one of advantage and emolument, while it is felt that he ought to be elsewhere. This is true in social and political life; still more in ecclesiastical. To be in enjoyment of the loaves and fishes, and yet have the prestige of an Apostle, and of the *éclat* and excitement of a reformer and agitator, is a combination of good things that would make many a man think twice before he relinquished them. Now, to impute this as a motive to any individual, and stigmatise him with dishonesty because he remains in a position so alluring, would be rash judgment. But to ignore the existence and the power of such a motive, and its possible influence in any given case, would betray a simple unacquaintance with human nature.

Having defined what is here meant by honesty, now what is Ritualism? I would not use the word, if I could find a better. *Isms* have frequently a disagreeable sound; there is apt to be a ring of reproach or sarcasm about them, which I again disclaim. My purpose is simple inquiry. I take the term as I find it; as one might take Whig, Tory, Federal, Confederate: or, in religious questions, Arian, Nestorian, Monophysite. Ritualism is named from the unauthorised ritual which forms its outward show; as Pietism is named from its supposed cultivation of inward piety apart from forms and ordinances. I cannot express my meaning by the word Churchmanship; for that is too broad a term, as if I were to say a Hampshire man, or direct a letter to my friend in Hampshire, without narrower designation. Moreover, no question is to be asked as to the honesty of Churchmen in general. There are thousands of clergy in England, for whose thorough honesty and loyalty to the system they have been brought up in, their practice is the best pledge. I do not say their system is true; of course I do not: but they are honest to it. They do not outstep it: the more pity for themselves, and their eternal interests. But they do not remain in the religious system which admitted them to its ministry, while their

convictions sympathise with another region of thought beyond. They have not learned, in self-defence, to misrepresent us, and call us names, as a poor weak defence against the popular impression that in heart they belong to us after all. No one shouts at them: "Change for Rome!" "Half way to Rome!" And thus, whatever their state before God, of which I know nothing, such honest churchmen and clergy may at least stand up unblamed and unabashed before their fellow men.

By Ritualism, then, I mean the religious system which revolves, as its central point, around a doctrine, in itself most true, but held inconsistently and out of place. It teaches that the adorable Sacrifice offered on Calvary is perpetuated and applied on the altar, though in a different way. It teaches, that on that altar of sacrifice the Eternal Word and Wisdom of the Father is as truly, corporeally present as on His throne of glory in heaven: that He has left on earth a succession of priests, to celebrate that Sacrifice of Himself, to the end of time: that, in order to prepare the souls of his people to partake of that Divine Victim, clothed in the wedding garment, His priests are empowered to hear confessions and absolve in His Name: that, to symbolise and express these mysteries, certain outward observances are congruous and important; sacrificial vestments, sacrificial gestures, accessories upon the altar, confessionals in the church, and the like.

This I take, more or less, to be Ritualism. And it is obvious to say, that all these things are borrowed goods. Such has never been the teaching of the Anglican church. But it is *our* own daily teaching, or would be, if our people needed it: for in point of fact they know it for themselves, and daily act upon it. When, by Divine Grace, a non-Catholic comes to us for instruction, we give them precisely such truths as I have stated. And as to externals, the Ritualists have simply opened our wardrobes, and made themselves fine in our clothes. Hence, you will observe, I do not ask: "Does Ritualism express anything true?" My question is another: "Is it honest?" Has it any right to be where we find it? Is the Anglican Church its true home? To be honest, ought it not to go further, and fare better? Is it not a hybrid thing? Does it not fall between two

stools, arousing the indignation of Protestants, and exciting great pity, not always respectful pity, among Catholics? Is it not, (to come to the three questions proposed), contradicted by history, incompatible with formularies, disliked and discouraged by bishops? Is not its teaching belied by its position? Is it not Catholic by aspiration, Protestant by stern necessity? Is it not tied to do the contrary of what it is fain to say? Is not the voice, indeed, Jacob's voice, but are not the hands, the hands of Esau?

In our present appeal to history, I do not discuss whether Ritualism, in mere externals, may accord with the first ages of Christianity. Ritualism is essentially a sacramental theory; and, so far, has an obvious first-sight likeness to the system of the Fathers, the early centuries, the early Councils. If you see a picture of St. John Chrysostom in his pallium, his stole with crosses, and his tonsure, and then read his book, *De Sacerdotio*; and if you are asked, to what section of the English Church you discover any likeness, you would not point to Exeter Hall, or Lambeth, or Fulham, or St. James' Square. It is neither Low Church nor Broad Church that rises to the mind. I reserve to another lecture the abhorrence with which every Catholic Saint and bishop would regard the Ritualist's rebellion against such authorities as he finds himself pledged to respect and to obey. But it may be freely granted, that in isolated opinions, and in some general principles, he is nearer those whom he justly admires, than the many who are included with himself in the same (unhappily) heretical and schismatic communion. He has several stones belonging to the arch; the only one lacking is the key-stone.

We are now concerned with two periods of history: the commencement of the schism under Henry VIII., with its first developments; and, again, the Oxford movement, some forty years ago, the progenitor (in a sense) of the Ritualism which is among us to-day. I will touch upon the latter first, and then hasten to the former: for we are chiefly interested to show that Ritualism can claim no historical connection with Anglicanism, as it was founded three hundred years ago, and accepted by its first disciples. The conclusion to be drawn from the historical proofs before us, is this: Ritualism, as distinct from Catholic



ritual, is a new thing, and (in the sense already defined) is no honest thing, in the communion in which it has sprung up. It is not Catholic ritual; for *that* simply grew up around, and clothed, Divine truths that have been held unbroken from the beginning, and by all who belong to the Church, which is its true home. It is no legitimate growth of Anglicanism; for *that* was founded in distinct contradiction to the Church which alone can teach unfalteringly the Sacraments, and alone can ordain adequate ceremonies and externals, to express Divine sacramental truths. Anglicanism has no doctrine to justify ritual. Ritual has always shared the fate of doctrine. Where doctrine was Catholic and true, ritual has been in necessary attendance, as its handmaid. Where doctrine declined, ritual was proportionably at a discount. To take one instance. In 1547, the advisers of Edward VI. still allowed "two lights upon the high altar, before the Sacrament," as they express it; "for the signification that Christ is the very light of the world." That is, the lights were symbolical and representative; not, as with us, an index pointing to the Divine object of adoration. To use modern terms, this piece of ritual was subjective merely; objective no longer. This was the first direct downward plunge in the official teaching as to the Most Holy Sacrament: therefore, consistently enough, the same Royal decree takes away holy water. And so, after successive descents, we come, at the end of three centuries, to Dr. Blomfield, bishop of London, who allows two lights on the communion table, whenever the day is dark enough to make them indispensable. During a London fog, he would go so far as to allow them in the morning. Thus we have three several stages of descent. Catholic ritual, following Catholic doctrine, has lights, of course, before the Adorable Presence. Edward VI. has lights still; not with direct reference to that Presence, but for a reason that might equally light them and keep them burning before a copy of the Sacred Scriptures. Dr. Blomfield allows lights, with a view to the state of the atmosphere and the eyesight of the officiating minister. Thus "truths are diminished from among the children of men." \*

\* Psalm xi. 2.; "decayed" says the Douay version.

This connexion between doctrine and ritual might be shown in numerous instances. Therefore, conversely, where doctrine and discipline were restored, ritual came back in their train. During the brief Catholic revival under Mary, we find that Cardinal Pole, among his first decrees,\* renews a former ordinance of John, Archbishop of Canterbury, (probably Peckham), to this effect :

“That in every parish Church there be a decent and handsome tabernacle, with silk [lining or cover], and key ; which shall be fixed at an elevation, in the middle of the high altar, if it may conveniently be done, or otherwise in the most convenient and honourable place that may be, and the nearest to the high altar : in which tabernacle the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist shall be reserved, not in a burse or loculus, but in a pix adorned inside with a linen cloth of the purest ; so that it may easily be replaced and taken forth without danger of loss (diminutionis) ; and that the ever-to-be-revered (venerabile) Sacrament Itself shall be renewed every week . . . We have thought well to add to this ordinance, for the honouring of the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the edification of the people, that a lamp or a wax candle shall be perpetually burning before this Most Holy Sacrament.”

When, therefore, people cry out against Ritualism, as being concerned chiefly with externals, such as vestments, postures, and the rest, I for one, am inclined to hold my peace, until we know more. It may be so in some cases, and who shall define in how many ? There may be, among the worshippers, a mere æsthetic perception of outward comeliness, which is quite distinct from true spiritual religion. And, among the clergy, whatever invests them with the attributes of the priesthood, is desirable and seductive, under many forms. A pleasure it is, also, to our poor fallen nature, to oppose authority, when we can persuade ourselves that we do it on principle ; to range ourselves on the side of progress, and the party of action ; to write and say strong things ; to get into the newspapers ; to be conspicuous among a party ; and, in a word, to make ourselves delightfully unlike other people. The develop-

\* Cardwell's *Documentary Illustrations of the Reformed Church of England*, p. 179. Digitized by Google

ment of such a thought I willingly leave to some caustic analyst of human nature, like La Rochefoucault, or satirical writer, like others that might be named. I do not admire that line of argument. But what has been said indicates, there is no doubt of it, an influential motive among mankind, and I know no reason why ritualist clergymen should be so supernatural as to be exempt from it.

First, then, Ritualism is no genuine exponent or development of the Tract movement.

I. More than forty years ago, a small circle of eminent and exemplary men had been led to the study of the Fathers, and of such elder Anglican divines as, few and far between, had cherished some stones of the arch, without the key-stone. Laud, Andrewes, Thorndike, Montagu, Ken, and others, members of the same communion in which those Oxford students and ascetics found themselves, encouraged a reverential study of the Catholic Fathers; and to this they gave themselves, heart and soul. They read, they prayed, they wrote, they influenced others in turn. Their convictions took shape; they became a movement, and that movement spread. England, they thought, had drifted away from what seemed to them the true principles of the Reformation. They desired to bring back the Church of the country to a certain type; say, the type of Laud as against the puritans. But to do this was to convert the country from various phases of error; indifference, low-church or no-church opinions, and the rest. In Oxford, and radiating from Oxford throughout the country, appeared a school of thought, with its very practical deductions; received everywhere with suspicion and alarm, because from the first it was seen to be an element uncongenial with the history and character of the Established Church, and uncomfortable in its manifest leaning. Leaning? but that was just what its disciples denied. Leaning towards Rome? On the contrary, their principles, they maintained, formed the only effectual bulwark against dissent on the one hand, and what they termed Romanism on the other. It was the *via media* of the Church of England. Those who opposed them, however, especially the bishops, knew better. They saw clearly the ultimate action of the movement. They saw what such words

as "Priest," "Sacrifice," and again "Examination of Conscience," really meant, and where the true home of such ideas was to be found. To justify the prediction, first one, then another, of those who consistently carried out the principles they had advocated on paper, found themselves, at length, obedient and richly rewarded children of the universal Mother.

Now, the relations of the Oxford movement with the Anglican bishops is for the present reserved; here I only add a word on the mild Ritualism of that early day. While I refrain from accusing these modern innovations of being merely, or principally, concerned with the frippery of silks and satins, and the cut of a garment, yet, its progenitor, that same Oxford movement, contrasts favourably with it, as far as I can judge, in its unmistakable earnestness. That Ritualists may be earnest, no one denies; they have built their churches with taste, and work their parishes with zeal. But this, certainly, would not have raised the wild tumults at Hatcham. An Englishman has a respect for any minister of religion whose heart is in his work, provided the said Englishman believes that work to be *honest* work. The late Dr. Arnold, "who," says Dr. Newman, "always spoke his mind," expressed a true English feeling, though he was unjust to the Tract writers, when he said, (if I may quote from memory): "The Romanist is the French soldier in his own uniform: the Tractarian is the French soldier in an English uniform, or in disguise. I should honour the first, and hang the second." It is because Ritualism is felt to be *dishonest* where it is, occupying a false and fraudulent position, that it has roused so deep an indignation, and brought its votaries under the edge of the law. What is the external manifestation of themselves, by which they have exasperated the people of England? Incense, lights, flowers, vestments, postures, and similiar specialties and eccentricities, that lie upon the surface, and appeal to the outward sense. It has not been doctrine apart from ritual, leading up to it; but ritual, rudely affronting a populace unseasoned by any adequate course of previous teaching. They have shaken in the angry eye of John Bull what he had been used to consider a red rag of popery. I cannot wonder at the result. To

show me a man dressed up in a chasuble, without having told me what it means, or convinced me that it was fitting he should wear it, contradicts my first perceptions of the gravity of religion. It has a theatrical look; it seems to the uninstructed like mumming. Now, the people of this country inherit from their Saxon forefathers a grave sense of the solemnity of religious observances; and they turn from the merely external or apparently frivolous with a deep feeling of distaste.

In the case of us, Catholics, our fellow-countrymen recognise, or might, if they inquired, that our externals, take them at the highest, are simply the expression and surroundings of Divine truths which we, the two hundred millions of us, are known to hold to a man. Englishmen know, too, that every jot and particle of what we either believe or practice, is the system of our bishops no less than of ourselves; nay, of ourselves from, and through, our bishops. They know, that, if we were bidden by him who represents to us the Supreme, to celebrate holy Mass in the philosopher's cloak, as of old, or the University gown, or the tunic of St. Paul the hermit, plaited of rushes, or in our every day attire, we should do so without hesitation. Nothing would be thereby shorn from the Divine ineffable reality of the "tremendous Mystery" on our altars. With us, the reality of the nucleus, which is an object of faith, forms the sole interpretation of the beauty, richness, variety, and significance of what may be called the outward rind. It is with Catholic ritual as with Christian architecture: in the one, no ornament is without its use in construction; in the other, no detail of ceremonial is exuberant, or unsymbolical of inward truth. Now, the Ritualists have not got the people of England to believe in their system. They have not, indeed, set about it in a way to secure success, but have begun at the wrong end. Instead of cutting out a chasuble, let them first convert a bishop. Let them bring round a real live bishop to their way of thinking. I am anticipating our third subject in saying this, and will leave, for the present, the unepiscopal character of Ritualism to fall on your minds by its own weight.

The Tract movement, then, stands in favourable con-

trast with Ritualism, in two important particulars: it was obedient to the bishops of the Establishment, and it made for essentials, not externals. The surplice in the pulpit, that palest and wannest gleam of Catholicity,\* was introduced chiefly as a protest against the Genevan school of thought, supposed to be symbolised in the black gown. There was no dream of borrowing anything from Rome, except books of devotion; and those only because what was called "the Church of their baptism" was so hopelessly sterile of anything that could feed the soul. Sherlock and Dean Stanhope were as dry as the sands of the wilderness; and in their native desert the Tract writers and their friends were fain to gather a little manna, though it was wafted to them from a foreign sky. Even that manna, a mistaken sense of fidelity to their position induced them, or one among them, to deprive of half its flavour: and there appeared strange anomalous editions of Catholic writers, "adapted to the use of the English Church." But, as for interweaving the Missal of St. Osmund with the Prayer-book of Parker, or reciting the modern *Confiteor* with the Ten Commandments, or wearing any stole, but a kind of half-starved chaplain's scarf, of penitential black, the idea never entered their minds. There was nothing akin to an advertisement which I see in a high church paper, of a book which must be a curious production:

"Divine Worship in England in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries, contrasted with *and adapted to* that in the Nineteenth."

The adaptations I have mentioned never dreamed of this, and were confined to the line of ascetical reading. Meanwhile, the Tract party stirred the heart of multitudes of earnest men in the land by preaching to the conscience: they put out a little work on Self-examination, which opened a new chapter in the religious history of England. Then there were those never to be forgotten parochial Sermons in St. Mary's, at Oxford, to which men came to listen, not indeed in great numbers, but earnest, and deeply stirred; and owed to them the first steps in the spiritual life, that at last led them home.

Time will not allow us to dwell on this remarkable

\* Newman's *Lectures on the Difficulties of Anglicanism*.

history. I can but say again, that if Ritualism is, historically, the outcome of that Oxford "searching of heart," and discipline of conscience and of life, the mother has no great reason to be charmed by her daughter's growth and prospects. Tractarianism (for want of a better term) was loyal to an authority that ill repaid its fidelity and devotion: it made its appeal to the conscience, and, if not content with, was at least patient of, the outward forms it found prescribed; it persuaded men to begin their reform within, and so radiate it gradually around. While it groaned under a bondage of which it became more conscious as time went on, it treated the ecclesiastical "powers that were," not with defiant opposition, not with open contempt, not with rude invective: but meekly, and I may say penitently, with a reverence that viewed, or tried to view and recognise, in them, the office which its first principle designed to exalt and to magnify. The "Tracts" themselves were stopped in mid-career, and one of the most powerful pens that England has almost ever known, was humbly laid down, at a single word from Dr. Bagot, bishop of Oxford. And so the disciples of that school won the grace, now this man, now again that, to see the loop-hole out of their prison, and to enlarge it, until they stepped forth, from the chill and straitness of a schismatic house, divided against itself, to the large space of the world-wide Church of God, and to the glorious liberty of His children.

Therefore, Ritualism is not for a moment to be confounded with the Oxford movement, nor to be taken as a legitimate growth from its principles.

II. Let us now go back to the cradle of Anglicanism itself, and its first launch into life, three hundred years ago. Is there anything here that justifies, or so much as indicates, or does not absolutely contradict, the Ritualism of to-day?

At the outset, we must not confound a certain love of magnificence in public worship with the principle under review. Elizabeth was fond of state and splendour. Lingard, I think, has a story, which I cannot lay my hand upon, of the Spanish ambassador being invited by her to witness the service as conducted in her royal chapel. There he saw good store of plate on the communion-table, two massive candlesticks, we will suppose; candles lighted, for

aught that appears ; and even, probably, that crucifix, which, Heylin tells us, was afterwards broken by Patch, the court jester, never to be replaced. The ambassador was too consummate a diplomatist to go out of his way to tell his thoughts to Elizabeth Tudor. But the Ritualists would not have been satisfied with these details. They would have asked for Mass : and, as to Mass, the same Elizabeth, at the commencement of her reign, had anticipated the Hatcham judgment. Take the following passage from Lingard. He is speaking of the year 1558 : the year of her accession.

“Hitherto Elizabeth, by the ambiguity of her conduct, had contrived to balance the hopes and fears of the two parties. She continued to assist, and occasionally to communicate, at Mass ; she buried her sister with all the solemnities of the Catholic ritual ; and she ordered a solemn dirge, and a Mass of requiem, for the soul of the Emperor, Charles V.” On the other hand, he goes on to say : “Oglethorpe, bishop of Carlisle, preparing to say Mass in the royal chapel on Christmas day, received an order not to elevate the Host in the royal presence. He replied, that his life was the queen’s, but that his conscience was his own ; on which Elizabeth, rising immediately after the gospel, retired with her attendants.”\*

We have already, in this incident, touched the key-note of much that is to follow. The question of that day, as the question of this, turned not only (shall I say, not even chiefly ?) upon the holy Sacrifice, though it is, indeed, one chief hinge of the Christian religion. No ; the real question was, the royal authority to decree doctrine. I affirm, that from the moment when Henry VIII., for his own evil purposes, broke from the centre of Christian unity, and by despotic force dragged an unwilling nation with him, the Crown took the place which our Divine Lord assigned to Cephas, the Rock. The Crown became the moderator and ultimate appeal in doctrine. It was a travesty of “Cephas confirming his brethren.” Was not the Royal Supremacy itself a matter of doctrine ? It had, indeed, its practical aspect too ; men died for denying it, and were pardoned on acknowledging it. The two greatest and best men then in



England, More and Fisher, lost their heads on that very score. But, in its essence, the Royal Supremacy involved religious truth or falsehood. Before the Pope refused to allow the King of England to break God's law, all England believed the successor of Peter to be constituted visible head of the Church, "even to the consummation of the world." It was a matter of religious belief, an article of faith, accepted by an *act* of faith, as it is now with us. When the crime was committed, and the schism accomplished, the King forbade that article of faith, by presenting himself as supreme head within these realms.

Let us hear Lingard on this point.

"On the ground of his [Wolsey's] conviction, it was argued that all the clergy were liable to the same penalty; because, by admitting his jurisdiction, they had become, in the language of the statute, his fautors and abettors; and the Attorney-General was instructed to file an information against the whole body in the Court of King's Bench. The Convocation hastily assembled, and offered a present of one hundred thousand pounds in return for a full pardon. To their grief and astonishment, Henry refused the proposal, unless in the preamble to the grant a clause were introduced, acknowledging the King to be 'the protector and only supreme head of the Church and clergy of England.' Three days were consumed in useless consultation; conferences were held with Cromwell and the royal commissioners; expedients were proposed and rejected; and a positive message was sent by the Viscount Rochford, that the King would admit of no other alteration than the addition of the words 'under God.' What induced him to relent is unknown; but an amendment was moved with his permission by Archbishop Warham, and carried with the unanimous consent of both houses. By this was inserted within a parenthesis the following clause: 'Of which church and clergy we acknowledge his Majesty to be the chief protector, the only and supreme lord, and, *as far as the law of Christ will allow*, the supreme head.' The Northern Convocation adopted the same language." So that here you have the language of the entire Anglican Church. With reference to the qualifying clause, Lingard adds: "Henry was yet wavering and irresolute; he sought to intimi-

date the Court of Rome, but had not determined to separate from its communion; it was therefore thought sufficient to have made a beginning; the qualifying clause might be afterwards expunged, whenever the occasion required." He adds, in a note: "Tunstall, Bishop of Durham, though he had received many favours from Henry, had the courage to protest against it. If the clause meant nothing more than that the King was head in temporals, why, he asked, did it not say so? If it meant that he was head in spirituals, it was contrary to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, and he called on all present to witness his dissent from it, and to order the entry of his protest among the acts of the Convocation."

Let us turn to another historical writer, an Anglican this time, for his account of the same event. We are considering an act on the part of the Crown, and of Convocation, highly representative on both sides. The authority of the Pope is disowned; appeals to Rome are cut off; "no foreign prelate," so runs the Oath of Supremacy, "hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction in this realm of England." The Church of England is going to be set up on its base. Where will you find the Church of England? Surely, in Convocation. Call it a synod; call it a Provincial Council sitting periodically, intermittently: if Convocation does not represent the Anglican Church, what can be said to do so? And, if it represents it, it acts for it, and pledges it. It acts in the sixteenth century, and pledges the nineteenth. Not to say, that every Convocation and Synod, from Warham to the anti-Papal agitation, has approved and reaffirmed the same doctrine.

Jeremy Collier, then, a non-juror and high-churchman, is our next authority. He tells us of the universal acquiescence of the bishops and clergy in this new title and order of things. This is, of course, the one important point. The schismatic Church, in the moment of the schism, accepted the Supremacy of the Crown, with all its consequences. The principle is obvious: it must be Pope or King; it wasn't to be Pope, therefore it was to be King. And the conclusion is obvious: that people now are talking unreal language, and quarrelling with the first principles of their communion, when they speak of the tyranny of lay

assessors and Courts of Appeal. They quarrel with the servant, who does but represent the master; the hand, that enforces the authority of the head. Had the Church resisted, then the assumption of the title by the King would no more have compromised the Church than that of *Pontifex Maximus* by Nero or Diocletian. Freedom would have been purchased by blood. The axe on Tower Hill would have been the best vindication of the Church of England. But it was not so. "Forasmuch as this people hath cast away the waters of Siloe, that go with silence"—the gentle and paternal rule of a divinely constituted head—"and hath rather taken Rasin and the son of Romelia: therefore behold, the Lord will bring upon them the waters of the river, strong and many, the King of the Assyrians, and all his glory: and he shall come up over all his channels, and shall overflow all his banks."\* Here is Collier's account. Let us premise, that Henry was not satisfied with a composition (for the *præmunire*) of £100,000 from the province of Canterbury, and of £18,840 from that of York: a sum which becomes enormous, when translated into its value in our day.

"This was not all," he says: "there was more than money required of the clergy. The King, perceiving the process of the divorce move slowly at Rome, and the issue look unpromising, projected a relief another way. To this purpose, he seems to have formed a design of transferring some part of the Pope's pretensions upon the Crown, and setting up an ecclesiastical supremacy. And now, having got the clergy entangled in a *præmunire*, he resolved to seize the juncture, and push the advantage. Thus the Regale was required to be acknowledged in unc customary language, and a new submission of this kind put to the Convocation. The author of the *Antiquitates Britannicæ* [Archbishop Parker] informs us, 'that the King refused to pardon the *præmunire*, unless the clergy submitted to own him their sole and supreme head, next and immediately after Christ.' Cranmer and Cromwell were suspected to have suggested this thought to the King. The demand of this new title surprised the clergy extremely; they were somewhat at a stand about the meaning, and were appre-

\* *Isaias* viii. 6, 7.

hensive dangerous consequences might be drawn from it. To overawe them into a compliance, the Lord Rochford, Cromwell, master of the rolls, and some of the judges, were sent to the Convocation: they told them that the King was resolved not to discharge the penalties incurred, unless they would acknowledge the title above mentioned. At last, the Archbishop [Warham] demanding the sense of the houses, most of them said nothing: upon which he told them, 'Silence implied consent.' To this they replied, 'Then we are all silent.' But, as such a dark imperfect way of declaring themselves was looked upon as unsuitable to a synod, and might be construed an evasive answer, it was thought fit to come to a more explicit resolution: and thus, at last, they agreed to acknowledge the King supreme lord and protector, and also, as far as was consistent with the laws of the Gospel, supreme head. The King was not pleased to find their submission thus softened with ambiguities and exceptions: Cromwell therefore was sent to the Convocation, and ordered to tell them, that unless they spoke plainly, and threw out the restriction, the *præmunire* would not be discharged. Upon this, they unanimously voted the King chief head of the Church of England, without reserve." "Thus far," adds Collier, "the author [Archbishop Parker, whom he is quoting], who is followed in this account by Mason, *De Ministerio Anglicano*." Collier, indeed, denies that Convocation submitted so unconditionally, and gives the same account which we have heard from Lingard; the insertion of the clause, "*quantum per legem Christi licet, supremum caput*." In any case, we have here the collective clergy of England, represented in their Convocation, giving to their King a title unheard of in Christian antiquity: a title to which, with the whole theory and practice implied by it, the Ritualists are bound, both by their predecessors and their formularies, at this day. Its concrete expression is Lord Penzance and his doings.

Now, I am not saying that every man, nor even every priest, has in him the spirit of a martyr: nor that, human nature being what it is, history recording what it does, we have any reason to look for it. We are not now concerned to lay blame anywhere; though it is a deep degradation, and I might blush, as an English priest, to read this servility

to an impious tyrant, in my spiritual forefathers. The details are given merely in proof of what is really meant by that Royal Supremacy, upon which, for example, the well-known Gorham case turned, twenty-seven years ago. Meanwhile, let us read the protest of Tunstal, Bishop of Durham, to which Lingard has referred. You will remember that, while he spoke, he had (I may say) the sharp edge of the axe turned towards him, throughout. He was not likely, therefore, with all his courage, to overstate his convictions. He is speaking, in the Upper House of Convocation, against the insidious clause, "in so far as the law of Christ permits." "This clause," he said, "seemed to have an inoffensive appearance at the first view: but considering that some persons, lately prosecuted upon suspicion of heresy, have interpreted these words to an ill sense, questioned the jurisdiction of their ordinaries, and endeavoured to shelter themselves from the censures of the Church; for this reason, I conceive, this recognition ought to be couched in terms more precise and distinguishing. For if the words hold forth no more than this meaning, that the King is, under Christ, supreme head in his dominions, and particularly of the English clergy, in temporal matters: this, as it is nothing more than we are willing to acknowledge, so, to prevent all misconstructions from heretics, the clause should be put in clear and decisive language. But on the other side, if we are to understand that the King is supreme head of the Church both in spirituals and temporals, and that this supremacy is conferred upon him by the laws of the Gospel—for thus some heterodox and malevolent persons construe the proviso 'quantum per Christi legem licet'—then, this construction being repugnant, as I conceive, to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, I must dissent from it. And notwithstanding the clause of 'quantum per Christi legem licet' may be taken by way of limitation and restriction, yet because the proposition is still somewhat involved, I think it ought to be farther discharged from ambiguity. For supreme head of the Church carries a complicated and mysterious meaning: for this title may either relate to spirituals, or temporals, or both. Now when a proposition is thus comprehensive and big with several meanings, there

is no returning a single and categorical answer. And therefore, that we may not 'give scandal to weak brethren,' I conceive this acknowledgment of the King's supreme headship, should be so carefully expressed, as to point wholly upon civil and secular jurisdiction." \*

Let us see how those two witnesses fared, whose courage did not blench from the axe which Tunstal, bold as he was to a certain extent, escaped.

I pass by the martyrdom of Fishér, bishop of Rochester, because the position of his conscience in the matter is expressed by that of Sir Thomas More. Collier says :

"When this question [of the Supremacy] was put to Fisher and More, their reply was much the same. They compared the act of Supremacy to a two-edged sword : and that there was no avoiding of it. For if a man answered one way, it would destroy his body ; and if the other way, his soul." It is clear, then, in what sense they understood this new title to be framed. Space forbids the insertion of the conversation between himself and Rich, the King's solicitor, to which More's own martyrdom afterwards formed the best commentary.†

Bearing in mind what this title was, and what it implied, let us pass over three centuries, and come at once to the Dean of the Arches Court. Has not Lord Penzance, layman though he be, and the Privy Council, or Court of Appeal, as delegated by the Crown, full right to adjudicate in matters of ritual and ceremonies, and on the doctrines involved? The Church of England has simply given them the right. Where, I ask again, will you find the living voice of the Church of England, if not in Convocation? Convocation represents and expresses the religious mind of the country, as Parliament does the political : and Convocation in the sixteenth century proclaimed itself Erastian, as we have just seen, and accepted the King, in place of the Pope, as head of the Church. To my mind, I confess, the Dean of the Court of Arches is more ecclesiastical, and less Erastian, than the passages just read to you would lead us to expect. He labours, even *ex abundanti*, to dissipate the illusion that the recent Hatcham judgment is one of many acts of tyranny or encroachment on the

\* Collier, vol. iv. p. 181.

† *Ibid.* pp. 278, 279.

part of the State. The State cannot encroach on what it has had from the beginning. This is the illusion which has pervaded the High Church mind. The Anglican clergy now assume themselves to be independent of the State in any ecclesiastical, or at least spiritual, matter. Hear the principle broadly stated, a year ago, by Mr. Mackonochie. We must allow for the rhetoric of a preacher, and for one speaking under the excitement of the Folkestone ritual case : but what he said was : \*

“For them, as Christians, the events of the week had no more relation to the Church, than when, as of old, some Roman Emperor issued fresh edicts for the persecution of the Christians. They must hold themselves altogether aloof from the idea that the Church could be affected in any way by what had been done. It had all come from without, not from within the Church. It could not touch them in any spiritual way.”

This would be true, if indeed the case were the case of Nero over again. But what if the Folkestone judgment, and the Hatcham judgment, and similar ones, represented much more the Anglican Church than Mr. Mackonochie and his friends? What if the Court of Arches is as much the Archbishop of Canterbury, represented, as the Congregation of Rites represents the Pope? What if it be bishop against inferior clergy? There can be no doubt, on which side we are to look for what is to be called “the Church.” And what, above all, if the power now exercised, under a very mild and lenient form, be only a portion of what “the Church of England,” in the moment of its birth, surrendered into the hands of the sovereign? Nero was never head of the Christian community which he persecuted : he was, as this preacher says, “without.” But Henry VIII. and his successors asserted themselves, and were acknowledged, supreme head of the Anglican body ; and they were “within,” or “above” it. This is the confusion in which the Anglican theory holds otherwise thinking men. The same sermon goes on to speak of the Church as living on “in the presence of its enemies—in the presence of the roaring wolves—sometimes making friends with them for the time, but only to become their

\* *Manchester Guardian*, Feb. 7, 1876. by Google

prey more easily when the day has come." These are excited words: but, if they were calmer, they would only express the same confusion of thought. The bishops of any communion could hardly be roaring wolves, bent on devouring the flock. At most, they might be "dumb dogs, not able to bark,"\* or showing their ability to bark chiefly when any of the flock strayed too near the pastures of Him Who said: "Simon, son of John . . feed My sheep: feed My lambs."

I cannot but quote the following sentence from a pamphlet by Mr. Maskell, written in 1850, while he was still an Anglican clergyman. He says most truly: "To reject the decision of a court, upon any matter really within its jurisdiction, before which we have consented to plead, and against whose creation we did not protest, because it happens to be against us, is the act of children and not of men."†

Lord Penzance seems not only to speak words of soberness, but actually to be speaking within the mark, when he says:

"It need hardly be necessary to call to mind, that the Provincial Court of the Archbishop is a purely ecclesiastical court . . . and accordingly, from the most ancient times, the chief means at its disposal for enforcing obedience to its mandates consisted in a sentence of excommunication. . . . As time went on, it was thought desirable by the legislature that the sentence of excommunication should, except in certain cases, be abolished and discontinued: and the Statute of 53 George III. c. 127, accordingly provided that the Judges of the Ecclesiastical Court, 'whose lawful orders or decrees have not been obeyed,' should in future pronounce the persons disobeying them 'contumacious and in contempt,' and signify the same to the King in Chancery."‡

This may well be called within the mark, because, if Lord Penzance had said broadly: "The Court over which I preside is only so far ecclesiastical as it represents the

\* Isaiah lvi. 10.

† "First letter on the Present Position of the High Church Party," &c., p. 41.

‡ *Standard*, Jan. 15, 1877.



Head of the Church sitting by delegation, in his vicar, the Archbishop of Canterbury," he would only, as we have seen, be repeating the language of Convocation, when the English Church was born.

If such statements are felt to be a grievance, what shall we say of the language of an Act of Parliament, passed in November, 1533? I recite it, because Convocation formed a constituent portion of that Parliament, and because no word of protest was raised against the Act by the clergy who, torn from Catholic unity, had so tamely submitted. Fisher we may be sure of, who sealed his testimony soon after with his blood; and Reginald Pole, who had vindicated his good name, some three years before, from the charge of having been present in the Convocation which bowed to the King's newly-invented claim. But for the rest—bishops, abbots, parish priests, members of the upper and lower house, the whole Anglican communion therefore—what voice was heard? No one to adopt the language of plain friar Elstow, when the Earl of Essex told him that he and friar Peto deserved to be put in a sack for preaching against the King's marriage with Ann Boleyn, and thrown into the Thames. "At this," says Collier, "Elstow smiling, replied: 'My lord, be pleased to frighten your court epicures with such sentences as these; men that have lost their courage in their palate, and softened their minds with pomp and pleasure. Such people, who are tied by their senses thus close to the world, are more likely to yield to anything. As for us, such menacing makes no impression; we count it an honour to suffer for our duty, and bless God for keeping us firm under trial. And as for your Thames, the road to heaven lies as near by water as by land; and therefore it is indifferent to us which way we go thither.'"\*

Such language, since the primitive age, has always been that of the minority. In the case of the Royal Supremacy, it was that of a minority that could be counted on the fingers. Even a celibate clergy is not necessarily heroic to face suffering and death: and thus, I repeat, the whole body of the English clergy acquiesced anew in such doctrine as the following:

\* Collier, vol. iv. p. 244. Digitized by Google

“Albeit the King’s Majesty justly and rightfully is, and ought to be, supreme head of the Church of England, *and is so recognized by the clergy of this realm in their Convocations*; yet nevertheless for corroboration and confirmation thereof, and for increase of virtue in Christ’s religion within this realm of England, and to repress and extirpate all errors, heresies, and other enormities and abuses heretofore used in the same: be it enacted, by the authority of this present parliament, that the King our sovereign lord, his heirs and successors,\* kings of this realm, shall be taken, accepted and reputed, the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England, called ‘Anglicana Ecclesia.’ . . And that our said sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall have full power and authority, from time to time, to visit, repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain, and amend all such errors, heresies, abuses, contempts, and enormities, whatsoever they be, which by any manner of spiritual authority or jurisdiction ought to be or may lawfully be reformed, repressed, ordered, redressed, corrected, restrained, or amended, most to the pleasure of Almighty God, the increase of virtue in Christ’s religion, and for the conservation of the peace, unity, and tranquillity of this realm; any usage, custom, foreign laws, foreign authority, prescription, or any thing, or things, contrary hereof, notwithstanding.”†

No wonder that Collier complains on this, that the clause “full power to reform all heresies,” etc., “declares the King to be supreme ordinary, makes his majesty, and by consequence those commissioned by him, judges of heresy, and puts the ecclesiastical discipline in their hands.” No wonder that he raises a feeble protest against it, in favour of the XXth Article, which declares that “the Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith.” Articles were all well in their place, until they seemed to come in collision with that primary article, *articulus stantis vel cadentis Ecclesiæ*, that the Sovereign is supreme head. They

\* It is observable, that the idea of a royal *lady* being the head of the Church, does not seem to have entered their minds, however Erastian.

† Collier, vol. iv. pp. 251, 252.

looked below, not above. "The Church hath power to decree." Yes; when its supreme head allows it. "Our said sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, . . shall have full power . . to redress, order, correct . . all heresies, by spiritual jurisdiction"—but I need not recite what you have already heard. Collier goes on to question: "Whether, upon this scheme, the being of the Christian religion does not lie at the mercy of the civil government?" Also: "Whether the bishops are not bound in some cases to make a stand against the *regale*; to break through an act of this nature in defence of their creed; to run the last hazards rather than throw up their commission, and desert the interest of Christianity?" Questions which would be all the more cogent, if he could show us one bishop, save only the martyred Fisher, who had ever done so, from that day to this.

But let us further observe upon this Act of Parliament.

(1) It asserts, without contradiction, that the King's title of supreme head, in the unlimited sense in which it is here rehearsed, "is recognized by the clergy of this realm in their Convocations:" that is, by the Church of England.

(2) The words of the Act, in all their tedious formality, are so framed as to give to the King every kind of spiritual power, except only preaching and administering the sacraments. These two obvious exceptions form the specious plea under which the XXXVIIth Article attempts to shelter the Royal Supremacy from reproach. "Where we attribute to the Queen's Majesty the chief government, by which titles we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended, we give not to our Princes the ministering either of God's Word, or of the Sacraments—but that only prerogative," and so forth, "that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers." Very well; but this only illustrates the force of Tunstal's complaint against the ambiguity of the title: for the questions immediately arise:

(1) What is meant by "*rule*?" Is it merely enforcing temporal obedience upon all ecclesiastical as

well as civil persons, that they may render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's? It has always been more than this. We have seen how Elizabeth, while she still professed herself a Catholic, and was going to hear Mass "ruled" Bishop Oglethorpe not to elevate the Host. The act of ruling this was a doctrinal act, for it involved the question of the Adorable Sacrifice. Or, if it be said that the elevation is a matter of discipline (a question into which we need not here enter) yet it is such a matter as could only be propounded by the Church in Synod: by no lay authority, and not by even the best of women. No church, even schismatical, that was not founded on the royal Supremacy, would tolerate such a ruling at royal hands. And, if we come down from Elizabeth to our own day, did not the Queen in Council, even against the Court of Arches, and as the ultimate appeal from it, decree the institution, to a cure of souls, of Mr. Gorham, who denied the sacramental efficacy of baptism? That decree went upon the ground that he was "sufficiently orthodox," *i.e.*, in the judgment of the Queen in Council. What was this, but "ruling" upon doctrine? The judgment, indeed, made a noise: but, like other noises, it subsided, "and they all lived very happy afterwards;" and the Bishop of Exeter, who threatened to excommunicate the Archbishop of Canterbury, dined with him in all suavity, and confirmed the catechumens of the heretical teaching at Bramford Speke: for, after all, was not the Queen supreme head?

(2) Again, to return to the 37th Article: Who are the "stubborn," who in the sense of the article, are to be restrained with the civil sword? The entire reign of Elizabeth furnishes a dark commentary on the term. Every one was stubborn, whose conscience forbade him to desert the ancient religion of England, the religion of Alfred, of St. Osmund, of St. Thomas of Canterbury, and of the Queen's own grandfather. If Henry VII. had been set aside from the throne, and living in some honourable retirement, as Catharine of Arragon had done, he would either have been forced to attend the Anglican service, or "restrained with the civil sword" of his gentle descendant. By her own will, faithful transcript of her father's, she con-

tinued it to be accounted high treason to dissent from the religion their despotism had founded. Gallows and quartering-block were the ultimate resolution of the argument.

Was is not then a grim mockery that she should say, in her Injunctions of 1559, that by supremacy was meant "under God to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within these realms, dominions, and countries, either ecclesiastical or temporal, so as no foreign power ought to have any superiority over them?" We come back to Tunstal's dilemma. Either such rule was over all her subjects in temporal things, and the temporal aspect of things ecclesiastical, and then it was a truism; or it was over all, clergy and laity, in spiritual things; and then it was a heresy.

I will give you an example of a "stubborn" man, who was restrained with the civil sword. They are to be had, by the dozen, in Challoner's *Missionary Priests*; but take this one. In a letter of Father Southwell, himself soon afterwards a martyr in the same cause, we have the following details of the sufferings and good confession of another priest, the Rev. Christopher Bayles, of the county of Durham. I do not quote them to prove the cruelty of the times, which needs no proof: but for the fact, so clearly brought out, that he suffered simply for his priesthood.

"For twenty-four whole hours, he was suspended by the hands, just touching the ground with the tips of his toes, cruelly tortured, and wearied by various questions; to all which he gave this one answer, 'that he was a Catholic priest, and had come to recall souls to Christ's fold; and never intended or wished any other thing.' From Bridewell, formerly a house of correction for [the worst characters], but now for Catholics, he was removed to another prison: . . . whence he was shortly taken to be tried, and capitally condemned, on the express count that, being a priest, ordained by Papal authority, he had come into England. . . . When they were about to pass sentence upon him, they asked the usual question, whether he could produce any reason why he should not be put to death. 'I should like to ask you one question,' said he: 'Was St. Augustine, whom Gregory II. [I.] sent into England, a traitor guilty of

treason, or not?' 'He was not,' they said. 'Why then do you say that I, sent by the same See for the same purpose, am a traitor, when nothing can be urged against me, that might not have been urged against St. Augustine?' They had nothing to answer to this, but their 'Away with him: crucify him.'"

"While he was being drawn on the hurdle to the place of execution, he sang psalms. When he had got up the ladder, he said: 'God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ:' then, lifting up his hands to heaven, and signing himself with the sign of the cross, as well as he could with his manacled hands, he said: 'You have come to see a man die; a common sight! a priest; *neither is that unusual*. I wish you could see my soul as well as my body, and behold the way in which it departs; for then I am sure that you would both sympathise and rejoice with me, no less than you now with such hatred imprecate curses on my head.' Then, asking all the Catholics to pray for him (for he said that the prayers of the heretics would do him no service), he fell to his prayers, and shortly afterwards, with fearless countenance and mind, he bravely and constantly underwent death."

I will not stop to ask what that simple word "death" really implied in cases of real or alleged high treason, in the reign of England's idol-queen.

"He suffered on Ash Wednesday, in the most crowded street of London,\* very many of the heretics praising his piety and constancy.

Then the hangman, with hands all bloody with this butchery and quartering, hastens to another street, to execute a layman, a man of probity, who had been condemned to die for comforting priests, and giving them alms."†

Now, plainly, what is the meaning of all this? Will any sensible person say that the man on the ladder, just going to be turned off, and the man in cassock and bands at the

\* "Fleet Street, on a pair of gallows erected over against Fetter-lane, and was there hanged, bowelled, and quartered, March 4, 1589—90." Challoner's *Missionary Priests*.

† *Rambler*, vol. i. 1857. The passage will be found quoted in the forthcoming volume of *Records of the English Province S.J.*, which contain a full justification, from documents, of more than one assertion in the text.

foot of the ladder,\* who exhorted him to save his life by acknowledging the Queen as head of the Church—that these two men represented a common priesthood? Did one of them belong to what might be called the senior, the other to the junior, branch of the same stem? Were they both equally capable of offering Sacrifice for the living and the dead? If so, I cannot withhold the remark, what double-dyed hypocrisy must those same Anglican clergy have been stained with, if they could thus smoothly act their part. Either they knew themselves to be sacrificial priests, or they did not. That they did, there is no one symptom or suspicion. And if they did not, it was because the bishops who ordained them, Parker himself, his contemporaries or immediate successors, had never told them. And if they never told them, it was because they had no intention of making them so. And if they had no intention, most certainly they did not make them, even if they could. The validity of the making depended on the power and the intention of him who performed the ceremony. “Take thou the Holy Ghost” might mean confirmation (supposing it sufficed for it) or might mean ordination, supposing it were backed by a known and formal intention. Without such intention, the form was insufficient, as has been affirmed unwaveringly, from Queen Mary’s reign to the present day. Its nullity is affirmed by the most emphatic of all affirmations, that of deeds, not words, whenever an Anglican clergyman has the grace to become a Catholic. He is first conditionally baptised; then unconditionally confirmed; then, if he proceeds to the priesthood, unconditionally ordained. And this, in the full light of Catholic teaching, that to iterate the Sacrament of Confirmation and of Orders, no less than to iterate Baptism, is a sacrilege.

\* See Challoner, *passim*, for this detail. The Anglican bishops and clergy had no mere otiose relations with the apprehension and martyrdom of the Catholic priests during the sixteenth century. The bishops’ palaces often became houses of detention for the confessors, previous to their removal to a more regular gaol. They underwent a rigorous examination from these prelates. The attendance of a minister at Tyburn and other places of execution disturbed the last moments of the martyrs, who were offered their lives, even on the ladder, if they would but acknowledge the Queen as head of the Church, or promise to go even once to the Protestant service.

Can proof be stronger of what the Catholic Church thinks of Anglican orders?

Let us go back to the reign of Henry VIII., for additional proofs of what was meant by that Royal Supremacy, against which the ritualist section of Anglicans is vainly struggling. You will observe that the Church of England (so-called) is in process of formation at the period we speak of. Though the bishops here concerned were true Catholic bishops, and the members of the lower house of Convocation true Catholic priests, however servile and cowardly, they did, in point of fact, acquiesce in the assumption of both title and power of supremacy on the part of the Crown. That the new order of things, the change of religion, did truly proceed on that platform, we have seen to be as historical as that the old order of things was founded on the Apostles, with Cephas for their head. The Pope was deprived, the King was instituted: instituted (so far as man could do it) into all that the Pope had before, except actual preaching and actual administration of Sacraments.

The reason for dwelling so much on this early stage, instead of carrying you on to Elizabeth, is twofold: first, the primary acts determined those which followed; secondly, the argument is *a fortiori*. The primary determined the subsequent, because each succeeding generation of clergy came into existence under a state of things already made for them. They inherited alike its temporal advantages and its spiritual bondage. They were pledged to it, unless they should repudiate it: and of such repudiation where is the symptom? Again, the argument, or proof, is *a fortiori*, thus: Bishops and priests, with the sacramental character of Order on their souls, with all the supernatural strength derived from their daily masses, succumbed in one body, by one universal act, to this national sacrilege of calling a layman their only head on earth in things spiritual. Why then should we be surprised, if their successors, whom the Church holds to be no bishops, no priests at all, with neither Orders, nor sacramental grace attached to their office—if they turned out as Erastian, to the full, as those who went before? Bishops and priests of old Catholic consecration, fell down before the footstool of Henry's thron



Why should not so-called bishops and priests, with no consecration but what Parker could give them, fall down before the footstool of his daughter?

With this principle in our minds, let us listen to Henry VIII.'s letter to the lord-lieutenants of counties; for it seems probably written to them:

"Whereas," he says, . . . "the Bishop of Rome's authority and jurisdiction have been not only utterly extirpated, abolished, and secluded, but also the same our nobles and commons, both of the clergy and temporality, by another several act . . . have united, knit, and annexed to us . . . the title, dignity, and style of supreme head in earth, immediately under God, of the Church of England, as undoubtedly evermore we have been: which things also the said bishops and clergy, particularly in their Convocations, have wholly and entirely consented, recognized, ratified, confirmed, and approved authentically in writing, both by their special oaths, profession and writing, under their signs and seals, utterly renouncing," &c. &c.

Is he speaking truth or falsehood? It was, indeed, an age of lies in the sycophants who surrounded him: but Henry himself was too absolute to need to falsify anything. His arguments were more trenchant. If it is falsehood, and mere arbitrary power, in which the clergy had no real part, why is no voice raised to contradict him? no Athanasius against the world, and the King? If he speaks truth, then what is this but national apostasy? We have seen what the supremacy meant: no need to go over that ground again. Tunstal's inexorable dilemma is ever fresh, and unanswerable. The supremacy is either temporal and civil; then it is a truism, which need not have been propounded—or it is ecclesiastical and spiritual; then it is a heresy, which cannot be accepted.

But does any one in his senses believe that Henry, who had reigned for years with an absoluteness which we may leave to history, was here simply re-asserting his temporal jurisdiction over spiritual persons, and over the temporal aspects and accidentals of spiritual things? No: he was placing himself, unreservedly, where the Pope had been before. Layman, despot, man of sinful life, not, as St. Paul, preaching the faith which once he destroyed, but destroying

the faith which once he defended, and which he died believing: the monster who never spared man in his anger, with whom the honour, the virtue, the life of his subjects was every moment unsafe: he, forsooth, must stand up to reform the Church of God. Incapable of ruling himself, he invents a jurisdiction over men's beliefs and consciences. Oh, gross, palpable imposture! But, if there is one fact more degrading still, it is that the claim of this "abomination of desolation standing in the holy place" is acquiesced in, and bowed down before, by the spirituality of an entire nation. There is a martyr, a confessor, here and there,

Among the faithless, faithful only found :

More and Fisher, and the Charterhouse monks, and the Abbots of Reading, Colchester, Glastonbury, with some few more—these go to martyrdom on the score of the Supremacy, or of the mock-marriage, the motive that urged the Supremacy on. And they are martyred in the face of a servile crowd; and that crowd (I blush to repeat it) is made up of bishops, of priests, of religious; men who would be the spiritual progenitors of the present Church of England, if the Church of England had inherited the Orders which they possessed, but did not adorn.

But we must go another step. You remember, in the life of William Tell, how the tyrant Gessler set up his hat on a pole, and commanded the same obeisance to be done to his empty hat as to himself. And so, Henry VIII., who was behind few tyrants, set up a representative of himself, in the person of a Vicar-General. Here we come down nearer to a series of Deans of the Arches and Privy Counsellors, even to the present day. Only, that I should do grievous wrong to the personal qualities and uprightness of those judges, by comparing them with Thomas Cromwell. He is here adduced as an historical fact, an historical precedent for Sir Herbert Jenner Fust, who adjudicated the stone altar case, and Lord Penzance, of whom we hear enough just now. It is like a sum in proportion. As was Cromwell to Henry, so is Lord Penzance to our most gracious Queen. Nay, the advantage is on the side of Lord Penzance and his Court: for he, at least, represents an Archbishop appointed by the Crown; Cromwell represent-

simply and immediately the Crown that gave jurisdiction to Archbishops. If the latter is more authoritative and supreme, the former looks more ecclesiastical.

Let us see how Cromwell executed his office as Vicar-General.

Collier says: "On the ninth of June, this year (1536), the Convocation met. . . Cromwell . . . appeared among the prelates, and by the strength of his Vicar-Generalship took place of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The figure that Cromwell made in this assembly was somewhat singular, especially as he had neither birth, learning, nor character to bear him out. 'For an ignorant layman,' says Bishop Godwyn, 'to preside in a synod of the most learned bishops that ever were in England, was but a scandalous sight. If this function could have been executed by one of the laity, the King would have done much better in person, than by such a proxy.' However, Cromwell had courage enough to support his commission: and represented the King up to all the points of state and ceremony. He appeared first in the upper house by his proxy, Dr. Petre; who claimed precedence, and had it, upon the score of his deputation."\* So that here you have a regular scale of ascent. Dr. Petre is over the Archbishop of Canterbury, who is primate of all England, because Dr. Petre represents Cromwell; and Cromwell, because he represents the King. How will the bishops submit to this? Remember Fisher: remember Tunstal. Is there so much as a third to join them? Or will they rivet the chains on their necks, and those of their successors? "As eggs are gathered that are left, so . . . there was none that moved the wing, or opened the mouth, or made the least noise."† And, as to the lower house, they have left us their utterances:

"In very humble and reverend manner," they say, "with protestation that we, the clergy of the lower house, in the province of Canterbury, neither in word, deed, or otherwise, directly or indirectly, intend anything to speak, attempt, or do, which in any manner of wise may be displeasing unto the King's highness, our most dread sovereign lord and supreme head of the Church of England; but in all things according to the command of God to be most

\* Collier, vol. iv. p. 343.

† Isaiah x. 14.

obedient to his Grace, to whom accordingly we submit ourselves :”—why, here you have men who would swear and unswear the number of the Sacraments, or the rubrics of Mass, or any definition or dogma whatsoever, if we may believe their words, just as their supreme head should direct. Barlow, on whom afterwards depended the consecration of Parker, sat at this time in the upper house of Convocation : and Barlow was informed against, at the time of the northern risings, or Pilgrimage of Grace, for having maintained the two following propositions, among others, given us by Collier :\*

“Imprimis : that wheresoever two or three simple persons, as two cobblers or weavers, were in company, and elected in the Name of God, there was the true Church of God.” And, still more to our purpose, as he was one of Parker’s consecrators :

“Item : that if the King’s Grace, being supreme head of the Church of England, did choose, denominate, and elect any layman (being learned) to be a bishop ; that he, so chosen, (without mention made of any orders), should be as good a bishop as he [Barlow himself] is, or the best in England.”

We discover, then, nothing of the “encroaching, persecuting civil power,” as people now vainly talk, but an act of the most hearty and universal acceptance, by the whole *Ecclesia Anglicana*, of its royal head.

To carry on the proof through the after reigns, Edward and Elizabeth, would be to transcribe half the volumes of Collier, Burnet, and Heylin. But, in conclusion, I will give two or three, extracted from an able letter to his former parishioners, written in 1851, by the late Mr. Dods-worth, soon after his reception into the Church.†

“The 36th Canon seems explicitly to claim this supremacy for the Crown. ‘The King’s Majesty, under God, is the only supreme governor of this realm . . . as well in *all spiritual* or ecclesiastical things, or causes, as temporal.’” He here adds in a note : “Edward VI. granted a dispensa-

\* Vol. iv. p. 388.

† *Anglicanism considered in its Results*. 1851. Not having at hand the pamphlet, from which these extracts have been made, I am not able to refer to the pages.

tion to Archbishop Cranmer and others to eat flesh meat during Lent, as the following document will show." He gives the document, which is couched in the most plenary terms, and adds: "Similar licence for Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter, and his wife, to eat meat on fast days, with six guests at table."

I continue to quote him :

"The whole history of the [Anglican] Church, from the Reformation, shows that these powers were then conferred on the Crown. No instance has occurred in which the Church (not merely individuals in it) by its executive, or otherwise, has claimed the right to judge of the appointment of the Crown to bishoprics, or to be the final judge in matters of its own doctrine and discipline.

"These powers have been frequently claimed by the Crown, and never reclaimed again by the English Church. Thus, to mention a few instances :

"At the opening of the first Parliament of Elizabeth, 1559, the Queen says that she has called the two houses together, to consult, among other things, 'respecting an uniform order of religion;' but at the same time asserted her right, if she had so pleased, 'to effect them of her own authority.'\*

"The same Queen issued her commission to four bishops to confirm Archbishop Parker; and when a doubt arose of the competency of his consecrators, the defects, whatever they might be, were pretended to be supplied by Act of Parliament.

"By some, it has been alleged that our sovereigns claimed no other supremacy than has been claimed by Christian sovereigns since Constantine. Against this, place the uncontradicted testimony (so far as appears) of Lord Montague in 1563, who in speaking in the House of Lords against a bill to enforce the oath of supremacy, says: 'Now, that the right of the Queen to ecclesiastical supremacy must appear to many doubtful, was evident from this; that, though enforced by law in England, it was contradicted by the practice and opinion of every nation, whether reformed or unreformed, in Christendom.'

"When Archbishop Grindal favoured the puritans more

\* Lingard, vol. vi. 3, 17.

than pleased the Queen, 'she suspended him from the exercise of his authority ; a threat of deprivation was added : and more than two years elapsed before he was restored, at his humble petition, and after a sincere acknowledgment of his offence. He could not, however, recover her favour ; in a short time he received a royal order to resign his see ; and if he was spared that mortification, it was only by his death.'" The writer quotes Lingard and Strype in support of these historical facts. We no longer wonder to hear Elizabeth's boast that she tuned the pulpits of the established church ; or that she said to another of her bishops : " Proud prelate ! I frocked you, and I can unfrock you." Such language was never used by Emperor in the height of his pride to St. Athanasius, St. Basil, or even to Pope Vigilius, though under their temporal power, any more than to St. Clement by Trajan. Persecution is from without, but the exercise of the spiritual jurisdiction of the Crown is from within.

In the same spirit as Elizabeth, "Charles I. acting under the influence of Laud, suspended Archbishop Abbot, and again restored him."

And my last historical fact, because latest in date, is this :

"In the reign of Charles II., A.D. 1675, in High Church times, on occasion of a bill being brought into Parliament, to impose a certain oath against attempting to alter the Government of Church and State, the bishops were asked from whom they professed to derive their powers. They replied, that the priesthood, and the powers of the priesthood, came to them from Christ ; *the licence to exercise these powers* [*i.e.* jurisdiction] from the civil magistrate.\* 'But,' exclaimed Lord Wharton, 'excommunication is one of those

\* Contrast the language of St. Thomas of Canterbury. His murderers asked him, almost at the last moment, "From whom do you hold your Archbishopric?" "Its spirituals," he answered, "from my lord the Pope : its temporalities, from the King." Reginald Fitzurse : "Acknowledge yourself to be the King's altogether." The Archbishop : "We are commanded to render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God, the things that are God's." They gnashed upon him with their teeth. He continued : "My lords, you threaten to little purpose ; you will find me foot to foot with you in the battle of the Lord" (Froude's *Remains*, vol. iv. p. 553).

powers: do you derive from the sovereign the licence to excommunicate the sovereign?' This, it was answered, was to suppose an extreme case, which never had arrived, and probably never would arrive.\* Here we have, on one side, a *reductio ad absurdum*, and, on the other, what must be called "shirking the question." A principle is often tested by an extreme case. The case might arrive of the sovereign falling into what the Anglican Church would consider grievous error. George III. used to shut his prayer-book with a bang, when the clergyman began the Athanasian Creed. Suppose the King to "affirm" his dissent articulately, instead of by merely making a noise, he would have fallen under the 4th Canon, as an impugner of public worship: in which case, says the Canon, "let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored, but by the bishop of the place, or Archbishop, after his repentance, and public revocation of such his wicked errors." And, putting aside the sovereign, the Archbishops in 1675 have no answer to the obvious question, how they were to proceed in the case of any subject deserving excommunication. Were they to apply for licence from the Crown? What would our ritualist friends say to that? The Canons provide excommunication *ipso facto* for twelve cases; but what about cases *sententiæ ferendæ*, as theologians speak? And, more broadly, what about all other cases of jurisdiction, into which no question of ecclesiastical penalty enters? "The oracles are dumb."

The same author continues: "That the Crown or the State still claims and exercises the same substantial supremacy over the establishment, is manifest from many recent acts. [He writes in 1851]. For instance, the State, by its own authority, and without any formal assent of the Church, has constituted and reconstituted bishoprics, divided dioceses, taking from one, and adding to another; has sent forth a bishop to the continent, and another to the East, investing its nominees with power to confirm, and ordain, &c., as the case may be." †

That "bishop to the East," by the way, was the schismatic intruder into the patriarchate of Jerusalem, who was to be the alternate nominee of the English and Prussian

\* Lingard, vol. ix. 269. † Dodsworth's *Anglicanism in its Results*.

Governments; a fusion of Anglicanism and Lutheranism in equal proportions, and equally unsatisfactory, I should think, to both parties: a bishop who would no more believe Consubstantiation with one half of his flock, than Transubstantiation with the Catholic Church.

The historical proofs now laid before you are of necessity fragmentary; but I hope they have been consecutive. To do justice to a subject so wide, demanding copious references and extracts, exceeds the limits of a lecture. I only wish that some one with the necessary leisure would give us the whole proof out of Collier, Fuller, Heylin, and the State Paper office. It would be overwhelming. It would show that when well-meaning people speak persistently, as they do, of being under State persecution, of working and suffering for the liberation of their Church, and ignoring the Court that has condemned them, they are, in fact, ignoring the very constitution of the Church that has ordained them; and that, in its most decisive acts, tacit and explicit. No one upholds this Court more entirely than the Archbishop of Canterbury and his suffragans: and this plain fact has drawn upon them an amount of rebellious language and vituperation from ritualist quarters which I shall have partly to notice hereafter. To speak of the decisions of the Court and the position of the Bishops as melancholy, deplorable, intolerable, seems to me irrational language. These lay decisions are not only an affliction, but a symptom; nor only a symptom, but a proof. It is the long problem of a schism of three centuries old, working itself out under our very eyes.

"Look, then," I would say to the Ritualist, "look unto the rock whence you are hewn, and to the hole of the pit from which you are dug out." These most obedient humble servants of his Majesty, who never intended "anything to speak, attempt, or do, which in any manner of wise might be displeasing unto the King's highness, their most dread sovereign lord, and supreme head"—these are unhappily, your spiritual ancestors; these have determined for you, once for all, the character of your communion. Holy Orders you have not derived from them; though it is not our present subject to prove this:



I can but state it and pass on. But what you *have* derived is the hopeless entanglement of things spiritual and temporal, as cordage becomes hampered in a wreck. You have derived your birth-place in a community which is as simply a department of the State in one way, as the Foreign or Colonial office in another. Edward VI., Elizabeth, and then the Stuarts, with their Convocations and bishops, took care to make that plain ; not as a matter of persecution, but of Constitution. As long as you remain where you are, you must needs be in the same dead-lock, for it enters into the nature of things. It is not affected by any change in the mere constitution of a Court. You will gain nothing by bringing back the practice of appeals to where it stood at the Savoy Conference, or any previous or subsequent period. God forbid, indeed, that your aspirations, so far as they are good and true, should be allowed to die. But there is one way only in which they can be realised. A home is awaiting you ; your Mother stretches out her arms to you ; her happy children are yearning, praying, to welcome you in among them. You are out in the cold ; and, if you prefer so to remain, your position, to the end, will have the manifold discomfort of finding none but your own *coterie* to believe in you for a moment. There is not an altar in Christendom at which you could minister ; not a priest, from East to West, no, not a Jansenist in Holland, who credits you with being in holy Orders. Your most devout disciples you are educating for us. As grace touches them, one by one, they accept its invitation ; they come to sit down in the Kingdom of God, and look back with regret at the years they spent among you, as the very bondage of Egypt. O sad fate ! thus to lose both worlds alike ; to be martyrs of your own wills ; to be sent to prison, and have the "Times" speak with contempt of your foolishness ; and to wake up in wiser moments to find that you have been simply running your tilt against a windmill ; that you are caught up and hurled to the ground by its two giant arms, Church and State.

## LECTURE II.

### *Is Ritualism Compatible with Formularies ?*

THE point we are now to consider drives further home the question, how far Ritualism is a system consistent with honesty? So home, that I begin to fear it will be impossible to keep altogether to my first position of considering that system simply in the abstract. The question now of necessity assumes a more personal form; inasmuch as it is the concrete Ritualistic clergyman with whom we are concerned. We have before us a man who, again and again, in the most solemn turning-points of his life, no one compelling him, under pressure of no dire necessity or overmastering fear, that might diminish volition, but calmly, deliberately, repeatedly, has bound himself to the "willing and *ex animo*" acceptance of certain Articles of religion: bound himself to perform Divine service among his flock according to certain formularies of prayer. Our former inquiry was the more abstract question: Is Ritualism, where we find it, an honest thing; is it a legitimate expression of its birth-hour, and family character? But we are now tided, will we or no, into a closer and more intimate question: Is that man, who is pledged as he is pledged, and yet acts as he acts—is he, can he be considered, an honest man?

The subject divides itself naturally under three heads. We will consider therefore, in succession, the Articles, the Homilies, the Prayer-book. For these are a three-fold cord that binds every clergyman of the Established Church. The obligation, indeed, is manifold; the Articles bind him to the Homilies; the Homilies enforce the teaching of the Articles; the Prayer-book endorses the Articles again.

First, Article xxxv. says: "The Second Book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this Article, doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and

necessary for these times, as doth"—it is a Parthian arrow, aimed by retrospect—"the former Book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of Edward VI.; and therefore we judge them to be read in churches by the ministers, diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood of the people." This, then, is the testimony borne by the Article to the Homilies.

Secondly: the Homilies, in turn, bind those who subscribe the Articles to the same teaching as the Articles, and even in stronger language. They contain a "godly and wholesome doctrine," and are therefore to be read: and, when read, they deliver their doctrine roundly, as we shall see. The Articles are the fence, the Homilies the pasture. Both mean one and the same. And mean what? You must not quarrel with terms; how can any one explain his meaning without definite recognised names of religious opinion? Both Articles and Homilies, then, mean the most unmitigated Protestantism.

Lastly comes the Prayer-book, with its stammering utterances; wavering, swaying between opposite schools of thought, and on the most vital truth. An attempt is made to conciliate on one hand the remnant of Catholics in England, too weak for martyrdom, or fines and imprisonment: on the other hand, the Zurich refugees and their disciples. It satisfies the yearnings of neither, because it attempts an impossible middle-path between the two. This Prayer-book is bound on every Anglican clergyman by a two-fold obligation: (1) by the Canons, which of course he holds; for who can be an honest member of a Church, and dissent from the Canons and Constitutions of that Church? (2) by his own solemn declaration, in the face of the people to whom he is to minister—a declaration of unfeigned assent and consent to all the Prayer-book contains.

A word, by the way, about the Canons; since they do not come so immediately under our three heads. People talk about the thunders of the Vatican, as though they went beyond St. Paul's threat of delivering the contumacious to Satan, that they might learn not to blaspheme. But have they ever listened to the Canons of the Church of England? They who are now contending that their Church is under bondage, as though that bondage were of later growth; and

that a tribunal headed by a layman representing the Archbishop, under the Crown, is a usurped jurisdiction not contemplated by the Reformers—what would they say to the second Canon? It speaks thus :

*"Impugners of the King's Supremacy censured.* Whosoever shall hereafter affirm that the King's Majesty hath not the same authority in causes ecclesiastical, that the godly Kings had amongst the Jews, and Christian Emperors of the Primitive Church; or *impeach in any part* his regal Supremacy in the said causes restored to the Crown, and by the laws of this realm therein established; let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored, but only by the Archbishop, after his repentance, and public revocation of those his wicked errors." Here, then, if there were no Article among the Thirty-nine touching upon the Royal Supremacy, yet every clergyman who impeaches, in any part, that Supremacy in causes ecclesiastical, is *ipso facto* excommunicated by his Church, if the Canons bind him. And how far do they not bind? According to the Preface, they are "Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, treated upon by the Bishop of London,\* President of the Convocation for the Province of Canterbury, and the rest of the Bishops and Clergy of the said Province, and agreed upon with the King's Majesty's Licence, in their Synod begun at London, Anno Domini 1603, and now published for the due observation of them, by His Majesty's Authority, under the Great Seal of England."

Here we see that a solemn act of the Province of Canterbury in Synod assembled condemns those who impugn the Royal Supremacy in causes ecclesiastical. And who, now, are they? Nay, we might almost ask: Who are they not? Look around. Clergy and laity alike, who are talking, writing, preaching, acting, disobeying, with a unity and persistency of which they boast, with contumacy and contempt of court: all excommunicated, if the Canons of their Church are worth a rush. Excommunicated, *ipso facto*, by the very act of impugning, and in the moment of doing it; and not by an excommunication awaiting a judicial sentence. And an excommunicated clergyman, of course, is suspended, by implication; for the greater includes the

\* The See of Canterbury was then vacant.

less. His ministrations, therefore, become invalid from that moment. The only reason for not insisting more on this is, that his ministrations have been invalid from the first.

The Anglican Church, then, in Synod assembled, has drawn up these Canons. They bind, of course; they are not a mere *brutum fulmen*. They bind each individual clergyman; bind him in conscience, as well as in external act. If his Church be a Church, then are its Canons authoritative. If they are not authoritative, then is his Church no Church. This is no deduction of mine. The Canons furnish me with it. I turn to the last three: entitled "Authority of Synods." The first of these, the 139th, runs as follows: "*A National Synod the Church Representative.*—Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, That the sacred Synod of this nation, in the name of Christ and by the King's authority assembled, is not the true Church of England by representation, let him be excommunicated, and not restored, until he repent, and publicly revoke that his wicked error." Certainly, if that discipline were in force, the absence of which the Anglican Church laments every Ash Wednesday, an easy exit would be provided for those who, for at least a quarter of a century, have been impugning the Supremacy under which their Church began. They would wake up, and find themselves expelled. Men have sometimes professed to be waiting for a visible sign: an unmistakeable something to tell them they were to go forth from Babylon, city of confusion, to Jerusalem, the Vision of Peace. I should have thought this Canon alone, had they ever chanced to read it, would have been to them as the handwriting on the wall. Are not Ritualists precisely those who are here denounced? They impeach, not in some things, but in all, the Royal Supremacy in causes ecclesiastical. They declare it to be an infliction, like some fresh edict of Nero against the Christians. In the sixteenth century, the Nero of Greenwich and Windsor, and his daughter after him, would have made short work with them and their theory. And if now, in our milder day, they are not pronounced "excommunicate *ipso facto*, to be restored only by the Archbishop, upon their public revocation of those their wicked errors," it is because, with

the mildness of the times, has grown the weakness of their Church. Like a diseased and enfeebled body, it has not the power to cast out of itself those incongruous elements and morbid humours that remain festering within.

One cannot say, too strongly, what is required to enable the High Church party to assert their Church as apostolical and authoritative. It is required, not that they should have *permission* to teach their opinions, but a distinct and exclusive *injunction* to do so. We are going to review Articles that were drawn up, not as Articles of truth, but of peace; the second best thing only, according to St. James the Apostle, and inadmissible in Divine revelation. Not so, however, according to James the King, who declares, in his Preface to them, "that even in those curious points, in which the present differences lie, men of all sorts take the Articles of the Church of England to be for *them* ; which is an argument, again, that none of them intend any desertion of the Articles established." There is no reason why men should "desert," by an escapade, a house which has open doors and windows on every side. But I will tell you what *does* escape at doors and windows on every side: doctrinal truth. Truth is not "what each man troweth." It does not endure a contradiction, or a compromise. It is then gone, like a jewel from the empty case that could not guard it. The Homilies? Aye, *they* speak out with no ambiguous voice. No "stammering lips" there. And why? They were speaking directly against points of Catholic teaching and practice; and they knew what they were about, as 'clearly as Judas when he sold his Master. The Prayer-book? We shall hear its stammerings and its compromises, and those, too, upon vital truths. The question, then, is not, How much a Ritualist clergyman is allowed to do and teach, but, What has he real authority for doing and teaching? What does his Church tell him to do? What would his bishop wish him to do? If Church and bishop alike were not so weak, so uncertain, so confused, so Erastian as they are, what would they enjoin him *not* to do? For that is his measure, as an honest man. To try and put (I use the metaphor with reverence) the new wine of his Ritualism into the old bottles of his formularies, is not only disastrous in the result. Bound as he is, by

subscriptions and oaths, it is dishonest at the very time of the fruitless experiment.

But some will say : These Canons ; who ever hears of them ? They are more than two centuries and a half old. Our clergy tell us as little about them as they do about the Homilies. As to that point, I know nothing : but I answer, (1) The Canons themselves hold another language ; those who drew them up, the Church in Synod, the Synod of London, did not reckon their obligations to be so light ; for the second of the last three runs as follows : Canon 140. "Synods conclude as well the absent as the present. Whosoever shall affirm, That no manner of person, either of the Clergy or Laity, not being themselves particularly assembled in the said sacred Synod, are to be subject to the decrees thereof in causes ecclesiastical (made and ratified by the King's Majesty's supreme authority), as not having given their voices to them ; let him be excommunicated, and not restored, until he repent, and publicly revoke that his wicked error." This is trenchant enough, considering that the 19th Article, and by direct implication the 20th also, affirm the Church not to be infallible. But, moreover, (2) A Canon, once truly passed, cannot be repealed, but by the authority that enacted it, or by a higher authority. I read of no repeal of these censures by the Church : none, indeed, except that to which Lord Penzance refers, when he says : "As time went on, it was thought desirable *by the Legislature* that the sentence of excommunication should, except in certain cases, be abolished and discontinued ; and the Statute of 53 George III., cap. 127, accordingly provided," and so on, as we saw in the last Lecture. It was a concession on the part of the civil power, for which the Ritualists can hardly be expected to be grateful.

If these Canons are not read publicly in Church once every year, it is not for want of a strict injunction to do it, on the part of the Anglican Church's head. "James, Defender of the Faith," having, as he says, acceded to the humble desire of his bishops and clergy, that he would ratify and confirm these Canons, according to the form of a Statute of Henry VIII., by his prerogative royal and supreme authority, in causes ecclesiastical : then, at the

end of the book of Canons, "of his princely inclination and royal care," he not only ratifies, confirms, and establishes them by his letters patent, but does "likewise propound, publish, and straightway enjoin and command," that they be diligently observed by all his loving subjects; and that "every minister, by what name or title soever he be called," shall read them once a-year in his Church or chapel: "straitly charging and commanding all archbishops, bishops," and so forth, to see to their being in all points duly observed; "not sparing to execute the penalties in them severally mentioned, upon any that shall wittingly or wilfully break or neglect to observe the same, as they tender . . . their duties and services to Us their King and Sovereign." Happy for our friends the Ritualists, that they do not live in the days when the Tudor had given place to the Stuart. James, no less than Elizabeth, would have been trenchant with "impugners of the supremacy in causes ecclesiastical." And they would have suffered, "without benefit of clergy," with no remonstrance against the Crown from any of their Archbishops or Bishops, who had besought the monarch's princely inclination and royal care to ratify, confirm, and establish these Canons by his letters patent, under his Broad Seal.

And now we enter upon an ungrateful task, in discussing the language of these formularies. Our Ritualist friends can hardly look upon them with more distaste. I am not, indeed, bound to them, as once I was, and as unhappily they are now. "Our soul hath been delivered, as a sparrow out of the snare of the fowlers. The snare is broken, and we are delivered." Still, it is never pleasant to pay even a passing visit to a prison, especially to a prison where oneself has been formerly confined. How can it be otherwise than painful to go out to one's brethren—fellow men, to say the least, and to see their affliction in the house of their bondage? Nevertheless, this is now before us: and I must ask pardon of those who, with myself, will feel that the words I am obliged to quote are nothing short of blasphemy. We may well shiver (as it has been well said), when we come to the coldness and vagueness of the Prayer-book: but we must first shudder in coming across Articles and Homilies.



I. First, then, of the Thirty-nine Articles. Ritualism purports to say Mass. I do not know what may be the use of terms hereabouts: but in London, in a leading Ritualist church, I believe it is quite customary to give notice of the early mass, and the late mass, Sunday masses, and week-day masses. On a recent occasion, when the Archbishop of Westminster ordered prayers among his clergy and flock for a special purpose, a notice appeared in that church, that all the masses on Sunday would be offered up for his Grace's intention. And, after all, whether the word "Mass" is used or no, the question turns upon belief or disbelief in the Sacrifice of the altar. We shall see, later on, that Mass was abolished by Edward and Elizabeth, and Communion substituted, not as a verbal distinction, but as a real substitution of one thing for another. The *term* Mass was unknown to the Fathers, who strenuously maintain the adorable Sacrifice. Wherever you have "celebration" spoken of, there is the doctrine, more or less explicit, that the Sacrifice on Calvary and that of the altar, are the same. Remark, once for all, that the terms Sacrifice, Priest, Altar, are correlative. Taken in their true acceptation, they stand or fall together. You may indeed speak of a priest of the Church of England, who is not a sacrificing priest, as you may speak of the family altar, meaning family prayers, or of a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, as the Prayer-book speaks: but these are instances of a misuse of terms. What then are the clergy of that particular London Church, in common with the sixteen thousand beneficed clergy of the Establishment, and I know not how many licensed curates, bound solemnly to believe? We have but to turn to the 31st Article. After reciting, what no Christian doubts, the all-sufficiency of the oblation of our Lord upon the Cross, but reciting it with a view to deny the continuance and perpetual application of the same Adorable Sacrifice on the altar, the Article draws this inference: "Wherefore the sacrifice of Masses, in which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits." Now, is there not here a point-blank opposition between two vital opinions? The clergy who profess to say Mass have, each of them, when the [supposed] cure of souls

was entrusted to him, affirmed as follows: I quote Canon 36. "I, A.B., do solemnly make the following declaration; I assent to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, and to the Book of Common Prayer, and Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; I believe the doctrine of the United Church of England and Ireland, as therein set forth, to be agreeable to the Word of God: and in public prayer and administration of the Sacraments, I will use the form in the said book prescribed, *and none other*, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority." So that he says Mass, or thinks he does; while he knows himself to be under solemn obligation (we cannot let him off that word "*solemn*") to believe the Mass to be a blasphemous fable, and a dangerous deceit. And this is to be reputed honesty: and we are to be held censorious, hypercritical, and altogether unneighbourly, if we venture to call it in question.

I know there are several subterfuges, by which men attempt to escape this plain conclusion. It is said, that the Sacrifices of Masses may be condemned, and still men may hold the Sacrifice of Mass; as though the Article aimed chiefly at the custom of celebrating private Masses. But this will not avail. For (1) The form of oath which the Archbishop of Canterbury administers to the Sovereign in the office of Coronation, and which every bishop (until recent times) was required to take when he entered Parliament, precludes such an interpretation. It runs thus: "I do believe that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any Transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, at or after the consecration thereof, by any person whatsoever: and that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary or any other Saint, and the Sacrifice of the Mass [not, observe, the Sacrifices of Masses], as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous." Mr. Dodsworth, from whom I take this, adds: "The argument so ingeniously urged by the author of Tract 90 will not avail here. It is not 'the Sacrifices of Masses,' but the Sacrifice of the Mass, or of the Holy Eucharist (for they are convertible terms) which is here expressly repudiated. And this agrees with the other facts of the case: namely, with the careful exclusion from the Liturgy of all words expressive of a re

sacrifice; and with the wording of Article xxxi. It will scarcely be urged that the Church of England is not implicated in an oath or declaration, for a long time actually taken by its bishops, and still administered by its archbishop to the Sovereign on the most solemn occasion." \*

Again, the Article defines what it means by Mass: "In which it was commonly said," and the rest. And the definition applies equally to high Mass or low Mass; to many Masses or to one. Mass is either a Sacrifice wholly and entirely, or it is none at all. The Ritualist believes it to be a Sacrifice: therefore, every time he attempts to celebrate it, he is doing what he has solemnly pledged himself to consider—I would not willingly repeat the terms. Once more, it has been alleged that the words "commonly said," and what follows, aim at a popular belief or mode of expression among Catholics—*Doctrina Romanensium*—rather than a strict theological statement. But neither will this avail: for the words in which the Article embodies our belief, to condemn it, are a very fair statement of that belief, and by no means exaggerate it. The prayer said in private by the Catholic priest, before saying Mass, embodies the same truth to the full.† So that there seems no way of escaping the horns of this inexorable dilemma: either the Ritualist is dishonest, in teaching by word and deed what he believes to be a blasphemous fable, and in setting forth before his flock what he believes to be a dangerous deceit; or, on the other hand, he believes Mass to be neither of these things, and then he is false to a solemn declaration deliberately made. In which state of mind shall we suppose the Ritualist to be? and which of the two involves the deeper dishonesty?

Here comes in the subject of vestments; because the vestments used are sacrificial garments. The commotions at Hatcham and elsewhere have been mainly excited by the chasuble. And I must do Ritualist clergymen the justice to say, that their simulation is nearly perfect. Like a photograph, which renders the dress faultlessly, and is only inadequate to "the human face divine," Ritualism dresses so well, that if the wearers were but priests, they would pass

\* Dodsworth's *Anglicanism considered in its Results*, 1851, pp. 86, 87.

† "Ego volo celebrare missam, et conficere Corpus et Sanguinem," &c.

muster anywhere. They out-herod Herod, and, like Colbert, are *plus royalistes que le roi*. But what is the meaning of the chasuble? It is a sacrificial garment: it has relation to Mass, and to nothing else. The Ritualist professes to say Mass; therefore he wears a chasuble. But his Church, which blasphemes Mass, of course refuses him the chasuble. If he wears it, it is in the teeth of the Canons. The 24th Canon prescribes a cope "in Cathedral and Collegiate churches, to be worn by "the principal minister" when he administers the holy Communion. The 58th Canon says nothing about a cope, but provides that "every minister saying the public prayers, or ministering the Sacraments, or other rites of the Church," shall have a surplice. So that the surplice, with hood, or tippet, is the minimum allowed; the cope is the maximum. Now, what is a cope? How many times has it been said, that the cope is not the vestment for Mass? It is a *pluviale*, used chiefly in processions, and may be worn by laymen. The Canon I have quoted is the authority for wearing it. What is the authority for wearing the chasuble? I will tell you: it comes backed by an authority that over-rides Canons, Articles, and Prayer-book alike: private judgment—self-will. Now, if a man goes out of the Communion which only allows him "such ornaments of the Church, and of the ministers thereof, at all times of their ministration . . . as were in this Church of England, by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of King Edward the Sixth"; \* if he sets up for himself, founds a free church, builds a proprietary chapel, elects himself his own Pope and Convocation; he may wear as many vestments as he will, and crowd his table with candles and flowers. He is an honest man, though not a very wise one: and he passes away from the focus of our observation. But, as long as he remains in a given community, he is bound by its laws: and it was for violation and contempt of the laws, not of a persecuting State, but of the Church that gave him his commission, that Mr. Tooth was most righteously sent to prison. While he retains his position, the formularies to which he has pledged himself, even more than the living prelates before whom he has taken that pledge, have a lawful hold on him. They bind him down to a certain course:

\* Rubric before the "Morning Prayer." 

"Thus far shalt thou go, and no farther." Unless he is to be a free lance, a Bashi-bazouk, or Christian unattached, hovering on the outskirts, his uniform pledges him to the articles of war, and he is amenable to a court-martial if he exceeds his orders.

What view of "the Church," again, are Anglican clergy bound to hold, by their subscription to the Articles? Their language, in these late proceedings, has indicated a Church to be listened to and followed, to be loved and suffered for; the supreme arbitress of truth, administering Sacraments (*i.e.*, two only), with 'all fidelity to the Divine will. If it were so indeed, it would be a happy accident, which no one would have a right to expect. For the Church of the Thirty-nine Articles, on the contrary, is a Church that may err, "not only in manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith." This fallibility Article xix. predicates of the great patriarchal churches: Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, Rome, especially, of course, the last. If a Patriarchate may err in faith, what is to secure a provincial Church? Where then is the pledge of the infallibility of the Anglican? She is demonstrably as much opposed, in vital doctrines, to the Eastern communions, as she is to Rome. She is in a minority numerically contemptible. What has she to show for her vital points of difference? Has she Scripture? So have they. Has she commentators? So have they. Can she quote Fathers? So much more can they. If Rome is fallible, by the verdict of Anglicanism, what is to defend Anglicanism from the verdict of Rome? And if Anglicanism is not infallible, then what is the plea by which Mr. Tooth or Mr. Dale would teach any lay member of the Protestant League? Superior acquirements? A layman may be the more learned of the two; a stronger head, a clearer judgment. The light of prayer? He may be more devout. Ordination? That is another moot point: how will they prove their Orders against the judgment of Christendom and the known intentions of the bishop who ordained them? The authority of their Church? But their Church, by a suicidal act, has declared its own fallibility. It has thrown stones at its neighbour's windows, and by the rebound has smashed its own panes. What a *reductio ad absurdum* do we arrive at, when we compare what the Ritualists say of

their Church, and what their Church declares, by implication, of itself!

So, again, it would be well to compare the teachings of those numerous manuals on Confirmation, which we see advertised in high-church newspapers, with their Article xxv. Confirmation is not even mentioned in the Catechism; and the language of the service is ambiguous enough. It has, like the Communion, a clause for high opinions, another for low; as though offering a choice to various schools of thought. It is marked by that miserable and fatal compromise, which is the key of the whole book, from cover to cover. The bishop prays that the Holy Ghost may descend upon the persons to be confirmed, but not coincidently with the imposition of hands. On the other hand, he afterwards, in a prayer, describes his own act to have been done "to certify them (by this sign)" "of God's favour and goodness towards them." What, according to the formularies, is Confirmation? Not a Sacrament of the Gospel, says the Article: not, therefore, "a sure witness or effectual sign of grace:" hardly, one would think, a corrupt following of the Apostles; certainly not a state of life. Yet these are the only alternatives which the Article offers to our thoughts. This negative teaching, or no teaching, of the Prayer-book and Articles, is a very different thing, I apprehend, from the earnest exhortations and careful preparation of their flocks for which the Ritualist clergy provide themselves with the manuals advertised. Here, again, I note a point of difference between their formularies and their practical teaching.

Penance, too, or Confession, which the clergy are endeavouring to extend to ordinary life, and make habitual, is only mentioned in the Article to disparage it. What are they bound, by their subscription, to believe regarding Penance? "It has no visible sign or ceremony ordained of God." Who tells them so? A marvellous presumption it is, to affirm it. For forty days our risen Lord appeared at intervals to His Apostles: "speaking," says even King James's Bible, "of the things concerning the kingdom of God." What if it appear at the last day, that during that period, as the Catholic Church teaches, He instituted the matter, the form, the mode of administering all the Holy Sacraments? What will then become of the Article? How will they look

who have subscribed its presumptuous denial? Penance, according to the Article, is among "those five," which are "such"—whatever may be the nominative case to that crude and shambling statement—"such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures." Which is Penance? We must leave the Ritualists the definition which they may prefer; there is nothing to help us. Do they accept this Article willingly and *ex animo*; and does it in any true sense either guide or represent their teaching?

II. Let us come to the Homilies. The two books of Homilies, one set forth under Edward, the other under Elizabeth, are declared in Article xxxv. to "contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times;" therefore they are to be read in Churches. Now, we may dismiss two clauses of this Article. A book may be good and wholesome, but so antiquated in process of time as no longer to be useful or edifying: therefore, if on that ground alone, it is not surprising that the Homilies are never read. Again, their being (supposed to be) "necessary for these times" is a consideration that may be left to the sixteenth century. "These times" is a term not to be taken to express all times. But, after these abatements, they are still declared to contain "a godly and wholesome doctrine," and are so subscribed, again and again, by every Anglican clergyman. Moreover, Article xi., after rehearsing, and therefore binding its subscribers to, the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith only, which it defines to be "a most wholesome doctrine," refers, for a fuller statement of it, to one of the Homilies, namely, that on Justification, or, "Of the Salvation of all mankind." So that the cord is doubled. The Anglican clergy have bound themselves to accept the Homilies as containing a godly and wholesome doctrine, and therein to accept the particular Homily named, together with the doctrine of Justification by faith only, which is propounded in it, to be "most wholesome." I will not do any of the subscribers the injustice to suppose, that he would ride off on such a sense of the Article, as that the Homilies contained wholesome doctrine, in detached words or sentences, which might be found here and there, as gold is washed out of the sand. That is the sense in which the

authors of "Essays and Reviews" would accept the inspiration of each several book of the Scriptural Canon; that portions of each are inspired; though how much or how little, and whether this sentence or the other, no one can ascertain. It would be a non-natural sense, indeed. No: they believe that the two books of Homilies, though neither inspired nor infallible, yet taken in the main, are what they are described and subscribed to be.

(1) What sort of notion, then, do the Homilies entertain of the visible Church of Christ? "The gates of hell," said our Divine Lord Himself, "shall not prevail against it." "If he hear not the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican." "The Church of the living God," says St. Paul, "the pillar and foundation of the truth." Now, such a Church as this may fairly be trusted, one would think, with doctrine and discipline. We might have a tolerably assured confidence that she would not let her children live unrebuked in a breach of the first commandment. The Church that was always to triumph over the gates of hell, pure in her youth, was not to be corrupted as time went on. If she had the keys of the kingdom of heaven, she would not, unless the Divine promise failed, let those keys be hampered, or lost. Still less, would she unlock for her children the direct avenue to hell. The mystical body of Christ was never to become Antichrist. So thought not they, however, who wrote the Homilies. "What man," says the third part of the Sermon on Good Works, "doth not see and lament to have entered into Christ's religion such false doctrine, superstition, *idolatry*, hypocrisy, and other enormities and abuses? Sects and feigned religions were neither the forty part so many among the Jews, nor more superstitiously and ungodly abused, than of late days they have been among us." Then the writer goes on, at a length which we cannot follow, and in language I should be sorry to quote, to declaim against the religious state, with its three vows; and against other Catholic doctrines and observances, akin to it; and breaks out, with enthusiasm: "Honour be to God, who did put light in the heart of His faithful and true minister, King Henry VIII., and gave him the knowledge of His word, and an earnest affection to seek His glory"—could falsehood or



adulation go further?—"and to put away all such superstitious and pharisaical sects by Antichrist invented and set up against the true word of God and glory of His most blessed Name." The historical accuracy of these statements, I submit, is about equal to its "godliness" and "wholesomeness," "God grant us all," he goes on, "the Queen's Highness' faithful and true subjects, as Christ commanded, to eschew all our pharisaical and papistical leaven of man's feigned religion." Our Divine Lord is here made to bid us, in so many words, to eschew papistry. What would be thought of us, if we were to declare, as though in our Lord's very words, that he commanded all men to eschew the Sadducaic and Protestant disbelief in Purgatory? "Corruptors of the words of Scripture" would be the mildest of the titles we should receive.

And what shall we think of the account, given in the Homilies, of the perpetual infallibility and inerrancy of the Church? "So was all confused, that scant well learned men, and but a small number of them, knew (or at the least would know) and durst affirm the truth, to separate God's commandments from the commandments of men: whereupon did grow much error, superstition, idolatry, vain religion, overthwart judgment, great contention, with all ungodly living." This is a pretty description of the previous state of things which Cranmer (the author of the great part of these Homilies) felt himself raised up to reform. Is Cranmer infallible? Was the Church built on him? Had he the keys of the kingdom of heaven? Does he represent the pillar and ground of the truth? Yet every Anglican clergyman, to his sorrow whenever he thinks of it, has set his hand to this farrago of irreverence, blasphemy, and falsehood. If it be "godly and wholesome," is it preached? If not preached, is it because anything more godly and wholesome is substituted for it in Anglican pulpits? If the doctrine heard there be at variance with what I have read to you, the question arises: Can two various doctrines be godly and wholesome together? "God is the Lord Who maketh men to be of one mind in an house," are words familiar to Anglican ears; but what about the sense of them?

If we meet with such precious teaching in a Homily

devoted to so apparently innocent a topic as "Good Works," the doctrine is not likely to be less repulsive, when we come to the Homily against Peril of Idolatry and Superfluous Decking of Churches. As this runs to over an hundred pages, I can only say that you will find in it the most hopeless confusion (may it appear at the Last Day not to have been wilful) between two things very distinct. The prohibitions of the Jewish law to a people rescued from Egypt, are applied to the use of sacred images which are used in Christian Churches, as memorials of the Christian prototypes they represent. You will find a wicked perversion of the text of the sacred Scriptures, by which the words *image* and *idol* are interchanged, and an attempt is made to prove them identical in meaning. You remember, perhaps, that in an early edition of the Protestant Bible, the text of St. John was rendered: "Little children, keep yourselves from *images*;" until these perverters of Scripture grew ashamed of themselves, and the right reading was restored. If the translators of the Bible grew ashamed of their prevarication, it was a wholesome feeling which did not extend to the writer of the Homily. He forgot, among other things, that his arguments were iconoclastic enough to destroy the golden cherubim in the Holy of Holies.

I had selected some passages from this long effusion to read to you. But, in truth, they are so offensive that I decline to wound your ears with them. You may easily obtain them for yourselves: they are published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, of which the Bishops are members *ex officio*. The Society has in this instance "promoted the knowledge" of a great deal that is neither "Christian" nor true. Englishmen in the sixteenth century were not choice in their expressions; and the unutterable coarseness of these effusions of a perverted heart prevents my putting them in as evidence, in any detail.\* Take only the following, as one of the most innocuous in point of language, while it goes every length

\* The Article only binds the clergy to the proposition that the Homilies ought to be read in churches; but the Injunctions of Edward VI. to the Bishops bind them to take care that no clergyman shall preach or set forth any doctrine contrary or repugnant to the effect and intent of them. Heylin, p. 37.

in contradicting our Divine Master's promise that the gates of hell shall not prevail against His Church. I can understand no greater prevalence of the powers of darkness against His mystical Body, than that the following statement should be true: "From simply having them there [*i.e.*, images in churches], it came at last to worshipping of them; first by the rude people, who specially (as the Scriptures teachen) are in danger of superstition and idolatry, and afterwards by the Bishops, the learned, and the whole clergy. So that laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages, sects, and degrees of men, women, and children of whole Christendom (an horrible and most dreadful thing to think) have been at once drowned in abominable idolatry, of all other vices most detested of God and most damnable to man, and that by the space of eight hundred years and more." \*

These are the ravings of a madman, or of one actuated by an evil spirit. But now, with all these echoes of "idolatry," and the rest, ringing in our ears, we will go into a church: and it shall be, if you please, St. Agnes', Kennington, a place of whose consecration we read. The first thing that strikes us is a vacant space in the stained-glass window. What is the meaning of this? It was an act of the Bishop of London. What did he do? He caused a crowned figure of the Blessed Virgin to be taken out. But who put it in? A clergyman who was bound to believe the blasphemy I have just quoted, and much that I have left unquoted, to be "godly and wholesome doctrine." We might go into another church, known by report.† There we should find the "honest moveable table"‡ converted into—I suppose one must not say, a dishonest—but at least a very immoveable one, raised on eight steps, and altogether a different thing from the "convenient and decent table" provided by the 82nd Canon: which, at the time of the Communion, is to be "*placed* in so good sort" (therefore moveable) "*within the Church or chancel*, as thereby the Minister may be more

\* Third part of the Homily against Peril of Idolatry, p. 253, ed. S.P.C.K.

† St. Clement's, Bournemouth.

‡ The term used in Sir H. Jenner Fust's judgment in the Cambridge Stone Altar case, thirty years ago.

conveniently heard of the communicants in his prayer and ministration :” with no thought of “celebration,” observe. More to our present purpose, we should see, they say, in the church I am thinking of, a Lady-chapel, with a side altar ; over it or beside it, an image of our ever-blessed Lady and of St. Anne ; in the stained-glass window, a representation of the Assumption ; and stencilled on the walls, “Ave Maria, gratia plena,” if not more.\* Honour to those who honour the favoured vessel of election, and instrument of the Incarnation of Almighty God. We have no want of sympathy in their act, considered by itself. All honour to them, as far as their act is honest and loyal to their position. But how about the Homilies, to whose godly and wholesome doctrine they are bound ? We will quote from these again ; and can do so now with the more freedom, because this particular passage, perverted and iconoclast like the others, yet speaks with a certain reverence of the prototypes of those images which the writer abhors. “The greater,” says the Homily,† “the opinion is of the majesty and holiness of the person to whom an image is made, the sooner will the people fall to the worshipping of the said images. Wherefore the images of God, our Saviour Christ, the blessed Virgin Mary, the Apostles, Martyrs, and others of notable holiness, are of all other images most dangerous for the peril of idolatry ; and therefore greatest heed to be taken that none of them be suffered to stand publicly in churches and temples.” It is no present object to prove the Church’s doctrine of holy images ; nor to combat the senseless perversion of thought which would make the Church of God fall to a lower grade than the impostures of Mahomet. But if Cranmer, or whoever the writer may be, is false, as false he is, in first principles as well as in dealing with his subject, are they then true, who with one hand subscribe this tissue of blasphemous folly, and with the other hand erect their images

\* However unwillingly, as well as mistrustfully, mere hearsay should be reported, it seems worth while to record the local account, that when the bishop came to the church (after its consecration), and animadverted on this inscription with some warmth, it was represented to him as a memorial of the deceased wife of a benefactor. On which he retorted, naturally enough : “Was her name, besides Mary, *Ave gratia plena* ?”

† Third Part, etc., pp. 258, 259.

in temples devoted to the national worship? The Bishop of every diocese in England would dismount those images from their pedestals, if he were not afraid of pushing things to an extremity. Where is the honesty of accepting such a state of things? How is it genuine, how is it loyal, to fill your house with furniture borrowed from your neighbours without leave, simply because they who ought to rule your house are paralysed with fear, and dare not forbid you, lest you should seek lodgings elsewhere?

III. We now come to the Prayer-book, that assemblage of contradictions and compromises. And here, at the outset, it may be said to me: If you describe the Prayer-book as being of this character, then why may not those who are called Ritualists have their interpretation of it, as well as others, of contrary opinions? I answer, there are limits to all interpretation. Stretch the Prayer-book as far as you will; after a certain point, it refuses to lend itself to the process. He who has the lowest opinion of baptism cannot omit the element of water, like a member of the Society of Friends. No one can administer the Holy Communion in bread and water, like the Encratites of old. Any one who should attempt such practices might fairly be denounced as dishonest, if he continued to hold position, and minister to a congregation, in a church devoted to Anglicanism. Is there less dishonesty on the other side, in the practice of those called Ritualists? I am not asking, is their practice on the right side, considered in itself? Of course it is. Theirs is a higher doctrine, involving a higher practice, than of many who are included with themselves in the same heterogeneous communion. But is all this doctrine and practice honest, where they are? They insist on calling their tables, altars: whereas, their church and their Prayer-book insist on calling those tables, tables. A table is a table, just as a spade is a spade. The school of thought, and the use of language, which transposes table and altar, *tends* indeed towards what is in itself, in its own home, essentially true: but, where we find it, is it not disingenuous and unstraightforward?

Take another point; one among the many in which it is difficult for the uninitiated to see how the Ritualistic clergy honestly fulfil their engagements. If there is one thing in which the Rubrics of the Anglican Church are explicit, it is

the prohibition of anything that could look like a private Mass, or the reservation of the elements after the Lord's Supper. This religious system would rather let its members die without the Sacrament, than permit a Communion to be administered by the clergyman to the sick person alone. Such words appear startling: so fearful is the want of charity involved, towards the poor Anglican in the hour of his extremest need. You know, my Catholic hearers, what would be thought of the priest, through whose neglect any of his flock should be left to undergo the great final struggle, unfortified with the last rites of the Church. Nay, what would the priest think of himself? He would never forgive nor forget his own want of care. Not so Anglicanism. It pronounces the Lord's Supper "generally necessary to salvation"; yet it refuses that boon to those who have extreme need of it, unless "three, or two at the least," shall be found to communicate with the sick person and the clergyman. "Cruel, like the ostrich in the desert . . . the little ones have asked for bread, and there was none to break it unto them."\* Die unhouselled, if you must, she says to her children: anything rather than that the shadow of a private Mass, or a Sacrament reserved in the tabernacle. To see this latter point, we must go to the rubrics. Look at a rubric in the Communion Service, as throwing light upon this other in the office for the visitation of the sick. As to the public Communion: "There shall be no celebration of the Lord's Supper", says the Rubric, "except there be a convenient number to communicate with the Priest, according to his discretion." This is certainly punishing the devout minority for the sins of omission of the indevout majority. But further: "If there be not above twenty persons in the parish, of discretion to receive the Communion, yet there shall be no Communion, except four (or three at the least) communicate with the Priest." How much of the Ritualist theory is here discoverable? What? the "celebration" is all that the Church Catholic proclaims it, and all that our Ritualist friends assert it among themselves, and yet a whole parish is to be deprived of it, unless you can find three communicants to receive? The more indevout the parish, the greater the need, one would have thought, of having the Christian

\* Lamentations iv. 3, 4. Digitized by Google

Sacrifice offered for them. Yet you can only go as far as the prayer for the Church Militant; you cannot have what it was the fashion to call "full service," unless the parochial piety has reached a certain mark. And that poor devout minority—Simeon and Anna in the temple—they are to be turned back from what they believe to be the Table of their Lord, unless you can induce some Gallio, "who careth for none of these things," to be good-natured enough to approach and make up their number. What a paternal government!

But, further, if this is hard, let us now go to the sick, to the dying bed. Surely, here, the rule will be relaxed? The poor Anglican is hovering on the brink of the eternal world. Will his mother do nothing for him now? On the contrary, his mother's face grows harder still. The string is drawn tighter. If in life he was chastised with whips, on his death-bed he is chastised with scorpions. The relentless rubrics pursue him, like the Eumenides.\* "If the sick person be not able to come to the Church, and yet is desirous to receive the Communion in his house"—(a natural desire, surely, if it be a tenth part of what Ritualists believe themselves to possess)—"then he must give timely notice to the Curate, signifying also how many there are to communicate with him, (which shall be three, or two at the least.)" And this certainly gives a tremendous force to a previous passage in the same Rubric, where the Curates are bidden to exhort their parishioners to frequent public Communion; "that so doing, they may, in case of sudden visitation"—(or when the requisite two or three are out of the way)—"have the less cause to be disquieted for lack of the same." The poor wretch, neglecter, perhaps, of Communion during life, turns his dying eyes to his Mother Church. Must he perish for lack of bread? Ah, there is a ray of hope for him! Has he, by any happy chance, the plague? That is his one chance; and the Rubric then consoles him: "In the time of Plague, Sweat, or such other like contagious times of sickness

\* The following is very significant from Heylin (p. 36). Among the Injunctions issued to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in the first year of Edward VI., to guide them in their visitation through the country, it was provided, that "to prevent sick persons in the damnable vice of despair, they shall learn, and have always in readiness, such comfortable . . . sentences of Scripture," &c.

or diseases, when none of the Parish or neighbours can be gotten to communicate with the sick in their houses, for fear of infection, upon special request of the diseased, the Minister may only communicate with him." But, if he is not fortunate enough to have the Plague, or any other of the qualifications specified, then, however urgent his request, he is to be denied the Sacrament, and exhorted to supply for it, as best he may, by a spiritual communion.

Now, let us draw a practical contrast. The Catholic Church, and the Anglican body, acknowledge, each in its way, the necessity of Communion: the Ritualist portion, in their own especial degree, among their co-religionists. On the principle, then, of Solomon's judgment, which is the true Mother in time of need? The Catholic priest is knocked up in the middle of the night, by an urgent sick-call. There is that hurried pull at the night-bell, which he knows so well; which has so often summoned him in the small hours, after an exhausting day, to the sick-bed of one of his flock. In a certain proportion of cases, he finds it an unnecessary call, when he gets there: but who can say? There is no defining in such cases; and he has, of course, to be on the safe side. Dressed he is, down in the Sacristy, out into the Church. He has the holy oils out of the safe, and the Adorable Sacrament from the tabernacle, and forth he sallies on his errand of charity. No thought of "three, or two at the least," of his parishioners, who are safe in their beds, poor fellows! after *their* hard day. Their priest is the only labourer in the parish, whose work-day never ends but in the grave. And the next Sunday, if death has come upon that sick person, he is able to ask the prayers of the congregation for such and such a soul, who has gone before God, fortified with the last rites of the Church.

The Anglican clergyman is also summoned to a dying parishioner. I will not inquire how often his sick-calls are night-calls. If his teaching has led people to summon him "in season, out of season," he responds to the call, even then; and out he goes, with a pocket-case, containing all that is requisite, according to his system. Then, if he cannot find the "three, or two at the least,"—as how can he, at two or three in the morning?—he has an alternative before him. Either he keeps that cruel, remorseless rubric, and his



parishioner dies uncommunicated, plead as much as he may : or he breaks the rubric in favour of the dying, who dies with such comfort as circumstances will allow. This is no fancy picture. I well remember my own anxiety and distress of mind, eight-and-twenty years ago, or more, at being placed within the painful choice.

But now, here is our point. In steps the Ritualist clergyman ; and he has a way of his own, free from all embarrassment. He is very rubrical, as long as the rubrics seem in his favour : here, the rubrics are dead against him ; well, then, he has his remedy ; he will be dead against them. "The agreeable people," says Disraeli, in a late fiction, "are those who agree with us." On this principle, there are rubrics and rubrics ; agreeable and disagreeable ones. The agreeable rubrics are those that agree with us ; the disagreeable ones are those that disagree with us : and those that disagree with us, we will disagree with them, and so end the matter. Out goes our Ritualist friend on his sick call, to communicate the dying man. What is he furnished with ? What are his obligations, what his difficulties, and what his remedies ? He is not going to summon the communicants required by his Church ; those "three aggrieved parishioners," he need not knock them up out of their beds, nor summon them from the social board, or from their ordinary employments, to prepare themselves, as best they may at a moment's notice, for the most sacred act of man's life. True, he is bound to have them, under pain of letting the man die without Communion. But that is simply a disagreeable rubric, and he does not agree with it. True, again, the rubric expressly enjoins that there shall be no reservation, after the public administration. "If any remain of that which was consecrated, it shall not be carried out of the Church ; but the Priest, and such other of the communicants as he shall then call unto him, shall, immediately after the blessing, reverently eat and drink the same." But this is a rubric fully as disagreeable as the other ; and he agrees with it no whit the more. As he disagrees with it, so he disregards it. What is more agreeable to him is an advertisement which he has read in the *Church Times*,\* and here it is : "*Reservation*, a convenient vessel for, to convey the Holy Com-

\* For Dec. 15 and February 9, 1876 and 1877. Digitized by Google

munion in both kinds to the sick. For designs and prices, apply," &c., &c.

Now, to speak gravely about this. Can there be an injunction more distinctly given by their Church, and, as it seems, more deliberately set at nought? If I quoted against them Article xxviii., that "the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not, by Christ's ordinance, reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped," it might be proved, by induction of instances, that they do every one of these four things. Does not this newspaper, a very unconscious witness and fair criterion, speak of the practice of the two first? A silversmith would hardly advertise his designs and prices for an article of which he was likely to sell one or two: the Sacrament, therefore, or what passes for such, is reserved among Ritualists, and carried about. It is also lifted up: for that practice formed one count of the indictment in the Hatcham case: "the elevation of the cup and paten during the Consecration Prayer," as Lord Penzance defined it. And, believing what they do about their Sacrament, of course, inevitably, they worship it, without staying to define the kind or degree of worship, which the Article has left undefined. All these four points, they are bound, as honest men, to believe, are not of Divine ordinance. Are the four points, then, of their Church's institution? It is wasting time to ask the question. What is the meaning of the Article they have subscribed? Do they not contravene it on all these points? Do they not falsify their own subscription? Is any one to be blamed, then, who asks the question: Is Ritualism an honest thing, as being compatible with formularies?

The following passages are from Mr. Dodsworth's *Anglicanism considered in its Results*, published in 1851. Ritualist clergy lay great stress on the Eucharist Sacrifice, or "celebration," and therefore, of course, on the Real Presence. Their teaching, we will suppose, on these points, approaches indefinitely near to the truth. Chasubles and "eastward position" seem to proclaim it. Altar-like tables raised on steps, and immovable, except by the united efforts of several workmen, point the same way. These, we readily acknowledge, are "schoolmasters" to "bring to Christ" such of their people as may hereafter have the grace of con-

version: they are pointers to the pole-star. But that consideration is beside the mark just now. I reiterate the question, even to weariness: Is "celebration," is the Eucharistic Sacrifice, is the doctrine of the Real Presence, *honestly* taught by an Anglican clergyman, as being the doctrine of his Church? "I proceed," says Mr. Dodsworth, "to consider what kind of witness the English Church bears to the grace and efficacy of the Sacrament of the holy Eucharist. Now, I may assume that the Anglican believes, substantially, the following doctrine: 1. That the very Body and Blood of our Lord are, in no merely figurative sense, but really and substantially present, not merely to the heart and soul of the believer, but, 'under the form of bread and wine' upon the altar. 2. That in this sacrament, the priest really offers, in commemoration, the true and proper sacrifice of that very Body which once for all was offered on the Cross; and that in this sacrament is transacted the perpetuation of that one Sacrifice once offered, which is propitiatory for the sins of the whole world." I must observe, as we go on, that the author seems to assign very high doctrine to those whom he classes under the general term, "Anglicans;" and that a good many who would claim that name would also demur to the fulness of the doctrine he here attributes to them. But to resume: "This, I suppose, is also, in substance, the belief of the Catholic: and, however others may doubt of, or deny the truth of this doctrine, no one can question its immense and overwhelming importance, if true. And yet, how very unsatisfactory is the witness which the English Prayer-book bears to it. Some passages indeed seem explicitly to recognise the Real Presence. Yet, perhaps with one exception (namely, the passage in the Exhortation, which is almost in words a quotation from Scripture) the Prayer-book seems to adopt the notion favoured by Hooker, that the Real Presence is not in the species of bread and wine, but only to the heart and soul of the believer; which seems equivalent to saying that the faith of the receiver, not the act of the priest, consecrates the elements. Hence, in the words of the Catechism, the inward part of the Sacrament is said to be, 'The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received *by the faithful* in the Lord's Supper;' and again, in Article xxviii. it is said, 'The

means whereby the Body of Christ (not merely the benefit) is received and eaten, is faith.'"

In a note he adds: "It is obvious to remark, that one single expression inconsistent with the holding of high doctrine in the Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice will tell more on one side than many expressions favourable to high doctrine will tell on the other. For these latter expressions are quite consistent with the supposition that the Real Presence was intended to be an open question; whereas it is utterly inconceivable that, if the compilers of the Prayer-book held and intended to enforce that doctrine, they should have allowed one expression of a hostile import to be inserted."

"Still more unsatisfactory," he goes on, "must we consider the history of the words used at the distribution. The old Catholic form, continued till the second Prayer-book of Edward VI., was: 'The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ keep thy soul to everlasting life;' in which words nothing less could be understood than that which was delivered was the Body of our Lord. In the second Prayer-book of Edward VI., these words were *omitted*, and there was substituted for them this form only: 'Take eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on Him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving.' Now, if the true doctrine of the Real Presence had been intended to be asserted by the later divines of the English Church, what would have been more natural and obvious than that when, on a subsequent review, the Prayer-book was relieved from some of the innovations of the foreign reformers, the ancient form should have been restored to its exclusive place; and that these words, [*i.e.*, the latter clause,] so obviously suggestive of a lower doctrine of the Sacrament, should have been omitted? Yet, what was done? The old form of words was indeed restored, but the later form was also retained *in addition*; suggesting, whether intentionally or not, an uncatholic interpretation of the old form. The more natural interpretation of the sentence, as it now stands, is that the first words are a prayer, which any one might use without any belief in the Real Presence; while the latter words suggest that the Sacrament is only taken in *remembrance* of a past act, and that the *eating* is no more than a

figurative action of the heart or intention. One cannot but suppose, then, from this history, that a sort of compromise was designed; that the doctrine of the Real Presence was intended to be left an 'open question;' that, while no violence was to be done to the prejudices of those who adhere[d] to the old doctrine, no repudiation was intended of the new."\*

Let us take Burnet's account of the same transaction. "It was proposed to have the Communion-book so contrived, that it might not exclude the belief of the Corporal Presence: for the chief design of the Queen's Council was to unite the nation in one faith, and the greatest part of the nation continued to believe such a Presence. Therefore it was recommended to the divines to see that there should be no express definition made against it, that so it might lie as a speculative opinion (!), not determined, in which every man was left to the freedom of his own mind. Hereupon, the rubric that explained the reason for kneeling at the sacrament, *that thereby no adoration is intended to any corporal presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood, because that is only in heaven*, which had been in King Edward's [second] Liturgy, was now left out.† And whereas, at the delivery of the elements in King Edward's first Liturgy, there was to be said: "The Body," &c., which words had been left out in the second Liturgy, as favouring the Corporal Presence too much, and instead of them these words were ordered to be used: "Take, eat," &c. . . they now joined both these in one."‡

The Prayer-book is, in itself, a record and a gauge of the progressive decline from Catholic truth and ritual. This might be drawn out at length, or shown in a tabular way, by placing side by side the First and Second Books of Edward, and the present Book, as it stands after successive alterations. Having only the First Book at hand, I can but compare that with the present Prayer-book, revised as it was at the Savoy Conference in the time of Charles II. My object is to show that the Anglican Church, from the moment when its founders cut themselves loose from the Catholic, had an

\* Dodsworth's *Anglicanism in its Results*, pp. 41—43.

† It was restored at the Savoy Conference.

‡ Burnet, *Hist. Reform.* vol. ii. p. 784.

unerring progress—downwards. The First Book of Edward VI. is, of course, less Catholic than the ritual of the Catholic Church; but it is more Catholic than the book to which Ritualist clergymen have declared their “unfeigned assent and consent.” Thus: (1) The name “Mass” is retained. The title is: “The Supper of the Lord and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass.” Less Catholic than the missal, inasmuch as the accidental and secondary is named before the essential and primary: Mass being the Christian Sacrifice, even where there are no communicants. More Catholic than the present book, from which both word and idea of Mass have disappeared. That word, however, soon disappeared, even in Edward’s time. In 1549, the Council, acting for the young king, commands Bonner, Bishop of London, that certain Masses of peculiar name be abolished, and that “the holy blessed communion, according to the Act of Parliament, be ministered at the high altar of the Church, and in no other places of the same, and only at such time, as your high Masses were wont to be used.” Therefore they took away low Mass, and high Mass had merged into holy communion.

The same year, Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, communicates to his Archdeacon the King’s letters to himself, *and sets himself zealously to give them effect*. They are to the following purport: In order to take away from the people’s minds any persuasion “that they should have again their old Latin service,” he was to charge all his Cathedral authorities, and the clergy and churchwardens of every parish in his diocese, “to bring in and deliver . . . all antiphoners, *missals* . . . and ordinals, after the use of Sarum, Lincoln, York, or any other private use”—I beg you to mark these words—“and all books of Service, the keeping whereof should be a let to the usage of the said book of common prayers; and that you [Archbishop of Canterbury] take the same books into your hands, or into the hands of your deputy”—I pause again for a moment, and will beg you to tell me, for what purpose? According to the theory which I must still call ritualism, for what purpose ought the Sarum missal, with all these others, to be called in, and taken into the hands of the Archbishop of Canterbury, or his deputy? Was it to see how much of it could be restored

to their new book? how it could be pieced, dovetailed, wedged-in; how their wine could be kept in those bottles, or pieces of the one system's cloth sewn into the garment of the other? How happy would clergy and laity of Ritualist proclivities be, if they could get Dr. Tait to take the Sarum book into his hands, with that end in view! Not so Cranmer. "That you take the same books into your hands, or into the hands of your deputy, *and them so deface and abolish that they never after may serve either to any such use as they were provided for, or be at any time*—[were they prophets, and did they look forward to the nineteenth century?]*—a let to that godly and uniform order, which by common consent is now set forth.*" So that Mass was abolished; for Mass and missal are correlative terms. Mass was abolished, and "the holy blessed communion" substituted: a reverential term, invented to cloak the abolition of the Daily Sacrifice. There were no more "celebrations," as we hear the term now used; but administrations only. And this even before the altars were formally pulled down.

But the very name "altar" vanished soon after "Mass:" as why should it not? The one implies the other. In the next year, 1550, Ridley, Bishop of London, issues injunctions at the visitation of his diocese. Wo to Ridley, if he had occupied Lambeth or Fulham to-day! He would have been handled by the *Church Review*, and at meetings of the Church Union, in the style which has become familiar to our ears of late. For he enjoins, under no State pressure, observe, but *proprio motu*: "That no minister do *counterfeit the Popish mass in kissing the Lord's board.*" He proceeds to enumerate twelve distinct points of ceremonial, which are to be abolished: all of them reverential observances in use throughout the Church Catholic at Mass, and prescribed in the missals, Sarum and others; those missals that had been gathered in, "defaced, and abolished." "And finally, that the minister, *in time of the Holy Communion*, do use only the ceremony and gestures appointed by the Book of Common Prayer, and none other, *so that there do not appear in them any counterfeiting of the popish Mass.*"

To return to our notice of King Edward's first Prayer-book. It is less Catholic than what it replaced, more Catholic than what replaced it in turn: for (2) it provides

indeed, that the priest shall have on an alb, "with a vestment or cope" (rather an odd alternative, if it is not meant for a synonym), and his assistant priests or deacons shall have albs with tunics: but all this, "for the ministration of the Holy Communion," as though the word Mass had been previously retained by accident. (3) It places the *Kyrie Elison* and *Gloria in Excelsis* (in English, of course), in their right place, instead of cancelling the first, and transferring the second to the Post-Communion, as in the present Prayer-book. (4) The Priest is to stand "humbly afore the midst of the Altar," and say the Lord's Prayer. Contrast the well-known words: "The Priest, standing at the North side of the Table." (5) It speaks of a "spiritual" eating and drinking, as though to exclude a corporal; and in this it agrees with the present book. (6) All who are not intending to communicate, are to depart out of the quire, except the ministers and clerks: but it does not appear whether they are to leave the church. Probably as the thought of the Sacrifice, apart from administration, was so fast vanishing, there was no intention that they should remain. (7) The Rubric ordering the preparation of the elements for consecration is more reverent, and goes more into detail, than in the present book. "A little pure and clean water" is also to be put into the chalice, according to the universal practice and symbolism of the Catholic Church. (8) "The Priest, turning him to the Altar," for the prayer of consecration, is replaced in the present book by "the Priest standing before the Table." (9) There is an act of praise and thanksgiving for the graces given to all the Saints, and especially "the glorious and most blessed Virgin Mary:" also, a commemoration of the faithful departed, taken almost word for word from the Missal. (10) The prayer of consecration is more Catholic than at present, and contains the words: "With Thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to sanctify these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine," with the sign of the Cross made separately over each. The words of consecration are directed, by a rubric, to be said, "turning still to the Altar, without any elevation, or showing the Sacrament to the people:" thus, as I have said, less Catholic than the Missal, more so than the present book. (11) In the exhortation to communicants, the words are not



"Draw near, with faith, and take," but "Draw near and take." The difference might seem slight, did we not remember the answer in the Catechism, which at first sight appears Catholic, but becomes Zuinglian as you approach it. "The body and blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received *by the faithful*:" and the words of Article xxviii. : "The mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is *faith*." A substantive and objective Presence, apart from the dispositions of the receiver, or, on the other hand, a Presence or an absence dependently on him, is the question involved. (12) The form of communicating each receiver, in both kinds, is the first and more Catholic clause of the amalgamated form now in use, to the exclusion of the second and Zuinglian clause.

From this comparative view of the two books, it is plain that the first book of King Edward, unsatisfactory as it is, as compared with the Missal, would be a considerable gain to our Ritualist friends. But what I must insist on is, that they are bound by the present book; bound to it, from title-page to colophon; for the beneficed among them, at least, have faced their congregation with their right hand solemnly laid on the book, and declared their unfeigned assent and consent to all it contained. And one would be sorry indeed to suppose, that the fact of possessing a benefice or not were thought to make any difference in the obligation to conform to the Prayer-book, or in the honesty with which that obligation is to be complied with.

The strong words that are to follow are not mine. They are from a very able pamphlet, published twenty-seven years ago, by a writer in the agonies of expiring Anglicanism. It smote upon not a few consciences when it appeared. It is called "The Morality of Tractarianism." Remember the proof I offered during the last lecture, of the loyalty which those Tract writers and their disciples strove to maintain towards the authorities of their Church. In the following passage you will find nothing akin to the rebellions of the present day. It is the voice of one smitten and agonized under an acute feeling of the discrepancy of Anglicanism, as a system, from the Catholic yearnings that possessed the writer. But its complaint is against a system of compromise

and deadness, not against its actual exponents. Hence, whatever may be said against the morality of Tractarianism applies *a fortiori* to its more modern and less honest developments. Thus, then, the writer speaks of the Prayer-book. "Oh that there were the heart in England, that would clamour for true words and plain teaching! Our Prayer-book, is that to be our battle-ground? Who cares for it? Who loves it as it is pretended to be loved? The poor? It has taught them for three hundred years, and they cease to believe in a Church. The Protestants within our Communion? They too have followed its teaching, and they neglect the Church. Professing Catholics? Yes, they indeed assume to love our 'excellent liturgy'; *they only pervert and disobey it*. Let each be true, and take a better cause to fight for than evasion. Protestants and Catholics\* alike despise and dislike the miserable go-between, which supports neither and opposes neither. Long ago, they have felt more respect for their own honest enmity for each other than for the 'moderation' of the prevaricating words with which it is endeavoured 'to unite both parties.' And what has our moderation done for us? Surely it has not saved us from division; for no country exists with so many 'denominations of Christians.' Nor can we say it has checked superstition, remembering what some of those denominations are: Ranters, and Jumpers, and Latter-day Saints. Nor that it has raised the tone of practical religion since it was adopted by the nation; for that too is, for the most part, but the same solemn compromise between good and evil, devotion and worldliness, which has stamped us, and all our institutions, with such respectability. That fatal tone of mediocrity, more fatal (one would not hesitate in saying) to the real growth of saintliness, than occasional outbreaks of the most violent enormities; more deadly than hot or cold; the detestable lukewarmness of a standard of practical compromises. It has not checked the worship of Mammon, it has not made us despise the world; it has not made us poor in spirit, pure in heart, obedient as little children. It *has* taught us to sneer at all high impulses as enthusiasm, and to make a jest at counsels of perfection: it

\* The writer, not yet a Catholic, means that party in the Established Church that owned Catholic tendencies.

has narrowed our sympathies, for it has taught us to think only as Englishmen, and to forget the faith and loyalty we owe as Catholics to the Church throughout the whole world. What can there be in this Prayer-book, which should make us fear to wish it better? Is it for its association with the thoughts of the men who drew it up, and pieced it together, out of torn fragments of venerable liturgies, which the rude hand of sacrilege had just stolen from desecrated altars? Is it for the memory of the Kings whose word made and unmade it day by day; for the love we bear for the names of Henry, and Edward, and Elizabeth? Has it preserved among our people those traditions, whose clear and distinct preservation is the only safeguard against heresy? If the Prayer-book distinctly and positively teaches the true doctrine of Sacramental grace, how is it that the common people neither understand nor act on it? If it teaches distinctly the Real Presence and the Sacrifice in the Eucharist, how is it that the common people have not received the doctrine? If its spirit really be to encourage, not to check, Catholic practice, why do the mass of people look on fasting, and all forms of mortification, as Popish? If we are not Protestants, how is it we glory in calling ourselves so? If we are Catholics, how is it that all (without exception) besides ourselves, persist in refusing to give us that name? Even if the intentions of its compilers therefore were unquestionably good, we must acknowledge that the book they gave us to make us one thing, has so failed, that it has made us exactly the reverse. And if it has so failed, why do we cling to it? why pretend to talk of its excellence, if it has not done, and cannot do, the only thing it was called on to effect? We do not want *permissions* to think truly; we want *commands*. Nay, more; we want commands not to think error. Surely, *that* is the only ground worthy to be taken by one who claims the authority of the Catholic Church. . . . One side or the other: only, no more compromise; no more interpretation; we have groaned under that burden long enough; no longer will we submit to the dishonour of a constant subterfuge." \*

I wind up with "the black Rubic;" for indeed, nothing can go further; and when we have stated its nature and

history, all else will appear weak by comparison. The "black Rubric" is so called, to express the abhorrence of it which they most justly entertain, whose case I am considering: just as the Articles are the "forty stripes, save one." They have subscribed to this Rubric, however, equally with the low Church and broad Church section of their communion. The black Rubric is the Declaration appended to the "Administration of the Lord's Supper," explaining the injunction given to communicants, to kneel when receiving. "Thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporeal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored (for that were Idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one." Black, indeed!

As to the history of this Rubric, Burnet has told us that it did not exist in the First Book of Edward, but was put into the Second. It was put in under the influence of Beza, Bucer, and their crew, who effectually stifled in the nascent Anglican Church any witness or protest against the heresies of Luther, Calvin, and Zuinglius. It was left out again under Elizabeth, whose aim was to unite all her subjects in one religion, and who wished therefore to reduce and minimise the points of difference, except only the shibboleth of the Supremacy. And so that Rubric remained excluded from the Prayer-book until the Savoy Conference, when it was put in again. Put in; left out; put in. Yea and Nay: on what point? On the question whether the Word made Flesh was or was not really and objectively present on the communion tables of the Anglican Church. "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid Him."

Having begun by a question, I will now end by repeating it. Is the system called Ritualism, and are they who belong to it, honestly in accordance with the formularies that have been subscribed to and sworn to? How does the case stand? No one is responsible for the personal

character of Henry and of Cranmer, of Parker and Elizabeth : but every one is, as the Duke of Wellington said about his conduct in diplomacy, "*severely* responsible" for the work of his own hand. If I have set my hand to a paper, and if by after-thought and experience I discover my inmost convictions to be at variance with its contents, I cannot let the question lie there. It matters not whether I have said : "so help me God;" or whether I have said : "I do solemnly make the following declaration ;" or whether it was, that I did willingly and *ex animo* subscribe. There may be differences in the guilt of disingenuousness, according to the degree of solemnity in the attestation and adjuration. But in any case, I am bound, both before God and man, not to remain in one position while my heart and convictions are with another. Otherwise, I must meet the fate I have courted. I must expect that not only a friendly lecturer, anxious for my good, but every man who is competent to compare my profession with my practice, should cast his imputation on my honesty.

There is a Catholic community, the Poor Clares, among whom the custom prevails, when a sister has ended her mortal life, to place in her dead hands a copy of the Rule which she has vowed to obey. It is a suggestive and a solemn observance, that she should thus go, as it were, before her Judge, holding the very code that must acquit or condemn her. How would Ritualist clergymen approve of a similar custom ? Would they desire to be buried, holding in their hands the Prayer-book, with its Articles and Canons, with its "black Rubric" and the volume of Homilies, and the Oath of Supremacy ? Yet these will be materials entering largely into the process of their doom. If "every idle word that men speak, they shall give account of it in the Day of Judgment," if "by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned," what then of words not idle, but deliberate and solemn ; not casually spoken, but in moments of sacred trust pledged and sworn to, by one who believes himself a minister of the God of truth ? In the Day when "judgment is set in weight, and justice in measure, and hail shall overturn the hope of falsehood," may Grace have enabled some who are now in the bondage of an unwilling engagement, to prove themselves

"Israelites indeed, in whom is no guile." Judging themselves no longer able with conscience to subscribe and to swear, may they follow out their convictions, and not smother them. May the freedom and the happiness be theirs which follow upon an act that lies inevitably before them, unless they are to recede from a known truth. They have to vacate a position which can only be retained with lesion of an interior sense of right and honesty, the unerring echo of the voice of God.

### LECTURE III.

#### *Is Ritualism promoted by the Bishops ?*

IN the question now before us, there might seem almost a want of gravity. It sounds like a grim sarcasm to ask, whether the system we are considering emanates from the Anglican bishops? Is it promoted or encouraged by them? or anywhere more than with uneasy endurance tolerated by them? Knowing, as we do, from their official utterances, and more significantly from their acts, how they regard it, can we seriously ask whether they promote Ritualism? Yet the question, as here put, is asked with all seriousness. The "honesty," as I use the word throughout, of the whole ritualistic position, is intimately concerned in it. This we shall see, by considering the personal obligations which the English clergy have undertaken towards their living authorities.

One need not, indeed, spend much time in showing that those bishops, one and all, though some more some less, discountenance and dislike, where they have not denounced Ritualism. That is a fact on the very surface. You need only step into Rivington's shop, and take up the first visitation charge that lies on the counter. It will be more to the purpose to show that, the fact being thus, Ritualism stands self-condemned by its own first principles. It starts on the assumption of having a succession from the Apostles, yet it allows itself to speak with unmeasured contempt of their actual representatives. It sees, in the bishops, those from whom alone it can hope to derive any spiritual power; and, equally, those from whom it is repelled, as by the repulsion of a natural law. A keen observer of society, not long deceased, has spoken, in one of his works, of So-and-so "and his natural enemy and father." The expression seemed caustic and overcharged, until the Ritualists arose to

exemplify it to the very letter. A great revulsion, indeed, has taken place in the feeling of the High Church party towards their bishops. Formerly, nothing was too good to be affirmed of them : now, if we may trust what appears in newspapers, the sentence might almost be turned in an opposite way. Formerly, they were the successors of the Apostles ; and the writers in the "Tracts of the Times" were the "Apostolic party" because they laid so much stress on this (supposed) succession, and on the consequent dignity and authority of the episcopal office. But now, these successors of the Apostles have become very unapostolical, because they are discouraging Ritualism. By an act of private judgment, as I shall endeavour to show, and thus by an essentially Protestant movement, the character of the bishops is made to rise or fall, according to the attitude they assume towards a mere section within their communion, a section at variance with the history of their religion and their country, and incompatible with the formularies its teachers have subscribed. "The agreeable people," I have already quoted the *bon mot*, "are those who agree with us." On which principle, it must be said, the Ritualistic clergyman and his bishop are persons eminently disagreeable to each other.

A good many years ago, a bishop of this diocese, Dr. Sumner, sent round a kind of circular, or examination paper, to his clergy ; in which occurred the following among other questions : "What are the chief hindrances you have found in the exercise of your ministry?" A friend of mine, a straight-forward simple-minded man, put down, in answer : "The world, the flesh, and the devil." Is it not merely fact to say, that a Ritualist clergyman would add a fourth chief hindrance to that tripartite division? He practically holds his bishop to be one of his chief spiritual enemies : as the bishop, on his part, holds him to be a most inconvenient thorn in his side. We shall be obliged to give particular facts in proof.

But first, I wish to view the whole question from the other side ; the unfeigned obedience, namely, which members of the true Church must always pay to their bishops. Then, by contrast, will appear the essentially uncatholic character of the Ritualistic movement ; which is so far from being



promoted and carried on by the Anglican bishops, that it is distinctly in opposition to them, and opposed by them in turn. What I desire to show is, that in proportion as Ritualism encourages a state of mind and action at variance with the living Anglican authorities, it recedes from the Catholic type, and becomes more and more sectarian within its own communion. Its principles announce themselves as apostolic, and it sets itself against those whom it believes to come from and represent the Apostles. It is all for "the Church," and it judges its prelates as traitors to the Church. In form and profession it is an episcopal persuasion: and in temper and bearing, it betrays itself as presbyterian.

Among the principles of Catholic life and action, few are more essential than obedience to Church authority. It is a principle of faith. "He that heareth you," said our Lord to His Apostles, "heareth Me, and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me." "Obey your prelates," enjoins St. Paul, "and be subject to them: for they watch, as being to render an account of your souls." The ultimate authority and responsibility is theirs, while the inferior clergy are their representatives and coadjutors. This cannot be too much insisted on; because it involves a radical error, affecting the whole Ritualist theory. In a true Church, everything comes through the Bishop. He is the "Angel of the Church," as St. John writes in the Apocalypse. He alone can confer orders: for he has the priesthood in its plenitude, as in a fountain-head; others by derivation from him. He alone can give his priests jurisdiction, separately from orders, and as an after act: that jurisdiction without which some of their sacerdotal acts, as, hearing confessions, would be not only unlawful, but invalid. The highest expression of episcopal authority is applied to the Pope, the bishop of bishops immediately under Christ: *Ubi Petrus, ibi Ecclesia*. So too (with all due limitations in the comparison), where the bishop is, there is the diocese, and all the authority of the diocese. If the Church of England were a true Church, its bishops true bishops, its clergy true priests, then the bishop could at any time retract the jurisdiction he gave. He could suspend every one of his priests to-morrow: and not an absolution could be validly given, until he had

restored those powers by an act as distinct and formal as that whereby he took them away. Hence, by the extent of episcopal authority you may measure that of clerical obedience. It is absolute. If a bishop is dissatisfied with one of his priests, he admonishes him. Should the priest (which God forbid) neglect the admonition, he can suspend him. If, further, the priest neglects the suspension, and exercises any priestly act, he becomes "irregular." If he contemns that irregularity, and still acts as a priest, he is *ipso facto* excommunicate. A bishop may exceed his powers. He may be harsh, misinformed, tyrannical : for he is human. But the priest has only one thing to do, short of an appeal to Rome. I do not, indeed, ignore the mercy and wisdom shown in having that final appeal left to us ; for the Church is not episcopal merely, but Apostolical also, founded on the Apostolic See. But, short of an appeal to Rome, the priest must lay his case, if it be a case of hardship, to the general account of his sins, and bear it as best he may : for the authority of the bishop can deprive him of jurisdiction, and so of the validity of his acts. It cannot, even if overstrained, be contested. We speak, thank God, of rare cases, in quoting the text : "The Scribes and the Pharisees have sate on the chair of Moses : all things therefore, whatsoever they shall say to you, observe and do."

Now, this Catholic principle of unhesitating obedience, not as to man, but as to God, speaking through His representative ("He that heareth you, heareth Me"), is a principle illustrated in every page of the Fathers, as well as of ecclesiastical history.

Take one of the earliest witnesses. St. Ignatius, the great martyr of Antioch, seems to have been raised up to proclaim this truth from his remote antiquity, with even startling distinctness ; lest any should say, it was an invention or an arrogance of later times. On his way to martyrdom ; in his seven short epistles, he thus writes : "It is fitting that you concur in the mind of your bishop, as also ye do. For your renowned presbytery, worthy of God, is knit as closely to the Bishop as strings to a harp." "The more any one seeth the Bishop keep silence, the more let him fear him. For we ought to receive whomsoever the

Master of the house sends to his household, even as Him that sent him. It is plain, then, than *we ought to look to the Bishop as to the Lord himself.*" "It becometh you also not to make free with the youthfulness of your Bishop; but, according to the power of God the Father, to yield him all reverence, as I know the holy presbyters do: taking no occasion from that youthful condition of his, which sheweth outwardly; but, as men wise in God, submitting to him; yet not to him, but to the Father of Jesus Christ, the Bishop of all. It is therefore meet, that for the honour of Him who favours us [*i.e.*, the God of mercy and grace,] you should obey without any dissembling; for, in truth, it is not that a man deceives this visible bishop, but he trifles with Him Who is invisible. And thus, the question is not with flesh, but with God, Who seeth secrets." "As therefore our Lord, being united (with the Father), did nothing without Him, either by Himself, or by His Apostles, so neither do ye anything apart from the Bishop and the presbyters. Nor attempt ye anything that seems good to your own judgment; but let there be, unitedly, one prayer, one supplication, one mind, one hope, in charity, in gladness undefiled." "Inasmuch as ye are subject to the Bishop, as to Jesus Christ, you seem to me to be living, not according to man, but according to Jesus Christ." "Guard against such men (heretics); and guarded ye will be, if ye are not puffed up, nor separated from the God Jesus Christ, and from the Bishop, and from the regulations of the Apostles." "The Spirit [the Holy Ghost speaking in him] proclaimed: "Apart from the Bishop do nothing." "Follow the Bishop, all of you, even as Christ Jesus [followed] the Father . . . let no one do anything pertaining to the Church, apart from the Bishop." "Let that be esteemed a sure Eucharist, which is either under the Bishop, or him to whom he may commit it.\* . . . Apart from the Bishop, it is neither lawful to baptize, nor to hold an *agape*; but whatever he judges right, that also is well-pleasing unto God, that all which is done may be safe and sure." "It is good to have regard to God and the Bishop. Whoso honoureth the

\* The Bishop, in primitive times, surrounded by comparatively a "little flock," was in most cases the celebrant at Mass.

Bishop, he is honoured of God : but he who doeth anything secretly from the Bishop, worshippeth the devil.”\*

These passages do not certainly go beyond the principle laid down by our Lord, that His Apostles and their successors truly represent Him, so that obedience or disobedience to them will be reckoned as offered to Himself. The words of St. Ignatius, however strong, are but a commentary and expansion, where our Lord has concluded all in two brief sentences. They are less a logical consequence than a mere enlarged expression. Let us apply some of them to the present state of things. It is plain that simple obedience to the Bishop, not enforced, but in heart and will, is here put forward as the token and test of a spiritual mind. The man who recognises God in his Bishop is the man who is walking by faith : the way to escape heresy is to cleave to the Bishop with the tenacity of faith ; and independent action, apart from the Bishop, is a direct serving of the Evil One. “Your renowned presbytery is knit as closely to the Bishop as strings to a harp.” This similitude could hardly be more forcible. Does it in any sense represent the relations of Ritualists with their bishop ? To prove the negative in detail would sound almost personal. Yet, how can this be avoided, if we are to deal with facts ? What, then, if a string should sound of its own sweet will, and declare the harp ought to take up the strain ? That is not the music contemplated by St. Ignatius. Honestly, is it not a description of every ritualistic effort through the kingdom ?

“The more any one seeth the bishop keep silence, the more let him fear him.” I apprehend that some, at the present day, are disposed to adopt a diametrically opposite rule. The more they see the bishop keep silence, the more strongly do they “come out,” as the phrase is, and the less do they fear him. He gives them an inch, and they take an ell. He goes, we will say, on the principle of anything for a quiet life ; or he regards their proceedings as *tolerabiles ineptiæ*, harmless things which he merely dislikes, without seeing his way to forbid them ; or

\* St. Ignat, Epist. *passim* : quoted in Waterworth's *Faith of Catholics*, Art. “Apostolicity of the Church.”

he looks on them as safety valves, through which a dangerous activity of mind may blow itself off, and do no further mischief; or he considers that a certain number of influential people, to whom he owes a courteous deference, are smitten with the æsthetic aspect of the movement, and and prefer chasuble to surplice, as their fathers preferred surplice to gown. Therefore, he keeps silence, and therefore nobody fears him. He is silent, or nearly so, except when his private opinion is asked, or when a memorial reaches him from an aggrieved congregation; or when, at a Visitation, he delivers himself of some rounded sentences which may mean as much or as little as you please: utterances about as emphatic as the General Confession in the Prayer-book is humbling, or the General Absolution effectual.

But go to that silent bishop in his own study: get at his real mind; represent to him some personal misgivings; appeal to the memories of Cranmer, or the judicious Hooker, or Laud, or Ken; or, more generally, to the glorious Reformation, and the Protestant faith. Instantly the harp (if I may beg pardon of St. Ignatius for such a travesty of his words) rings out responsive to the note upon that string. It is: "My dear Sir, you do not suppose me to have sympathy with that school of thought? Excellent men; but none of the safest: not sufficiently possessed with the *via media* of the Church of England. I gave them 'Goode's Rule of Faith,' all round, when I ordained them priests: I bade them remember, at the time, and most distinctly, that I had not ordained them *sacrificing priests*, in any sense.\* If they remember these words of mine, it will secure them against the sacerdotalism to which they tend; for it will convince them, on their own principles, of my want of intention at the critical moment of their ordination. And now, I shall allow them what I deem safe, for fear they should become further unsafe. They may have candlesticks on their Communion table: but they must not light them, unless the afternoon be a dark one.† I do not like the 'eastward position'; it is too like a sacrificial priest. But then, it so happens that, owing to the

\* Both these details are matters of fact.

† Bishop Blomfield's Charge to the London Clergy some thirty years ago.


exigencies of site, one or two of my churches point southwards ; so that when the officiating clergyman stands at the north side of the table, according to the rubric, he assures me that he necessarily turns his back to the congregation. That conciliates the rubric in our venerated liturgy, and the clergyman's idiosyncracies. Then, I allow a cross, provided it has no figure upon it ; why, our separated brethren the Wesleyans are building their chapels with crosses on them. I have even connived a tabernacle ; for I have been assured it would not open. The cope ? Why, an extremely Protestant dignitary announced his readiness to wear one ; and I find from Roman Catholic rubricians, that the cope has no relation to the supposed sacrifice ; it is a sort of cloak for out-door processions, and may be worn by laymen. It is worn by our venerated primate at coronations. A vestment used when the Head of our Establishment is installed, cannot be dangerous to its members ; that is, where it does not offend. At the same time, I confess, my own feeling is for 'a decent tippet,' or a graduate's hood. I can hardly imagine Hooker in a cope ; and Hooker is to my mind"—with as much more in the same strain as you like.

This is the bishop actual, as distinct from the bishop ideal : the bishop of Anglicanism, not the bishop of Antioch. It is the bishop with his large revenues, and high position, which no one grudges him. He has won a prize in the lottery of life, and has risen to the top of his profession. In the ecclesiastical order, his standing is analogous to that of a judge in the legal, or, among the faculty, physician extraordinary to the Queen. He has won his way to that eminence fairly : has edited Greek plays, been tutor to an exalted personage, written telling pamphlets, or worked a large parish with *éclat*. He may, indeed, have written something besides arguments against popery ; his productions have been anti-papal enough to find their place among the "Essays and Reviews." At any rate, he is a man of mark, whether by family, learning, or personal gifts ; and, as the old sleepy days are now over in the Church of the nation, and she is on her mettle, he can be no longer reproached, like his predecessors, with simply enjoying a mere *otium cum dignitate*. And yet, with all these goo-

things and comfortable things within him and around, one thing he lacketh. He wears, indeed, his ample lawn, the "sanctity" of which formed a topic for Chatham's oratory, beside the judges' spotless ermine : but there is a sacerdotal ornament he is doomed never to wear. It is the high priest's breast-plate of "Doctrine and Truth," with its mystic gems ; on which shone the unerring light from the mercy-seat, as an oracle to the people who waited without.\* This is a more impossible thing than the Ritualist's vestment ; it cannot be worn by an act of private judgment, any more than it can be bestowed by letters patent, or the Broad Seal ; it is independent of what Blackstone calls the "omnipotence of Parliament," and could not be carried by a vote of the united Bench. It is the all-sufficient, exclusive inheritance of those to whom the Promise has come, in its fulness : "He that heareth you heareth Me." And those are not the Right Reverend Fathers of the united Church of England and Ireland.

To come back to the great martyr, St. Ignatius. There is a first-sight irreverence in placing his words side by side with the terms of disrespect and contumely towards their bishops, in which some of the high church clergy now indulge ; but it conduces directly to the proof in hand. "It is fitting," writes St. Ignatius, in words already quoted, "that you concur in the mind of your bishop, as also ye do." "The work so well done," answers Dr. F. G. Lee,† the coryphæus of those who dream about corporate reunion with the Holy See, speaking of a possible revival of the monastic life in England, "would never be undone, whether by traitors in lawn or in linen, standing before the altars of the God whose servants they profess to be." "It is plain," pursues the martyr, "that we ought to look to the bishop, as to the Lord Himself." "Just," continues Dr. Lee, "as English Churchmen at Cape Town or Australia might look back to Lambeth—only they won't see anything very pleasant there just now." "Nor attempt ye," exhorts St. Ignatius, "anything that seems good to your own judgment." "If," responds Dr. Lee, "I could live to see the traitorous bishops of the Established Church turned out

\* Exod. xxviii. ; Levit viii.

† *Manchester Guardian*, February 7, 1876. 

of their sees, I would gladly consent to take off my surplice and stole, and say: 'Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace.'" "Apart from the bishop," insists St. Ignatius, "it is neither lawful to baptize, nor to hold an *agape*: but whatever he judges right, that also is well-pleasing unto God; that all which is done may be safe and sure." Look around," says Archdeacon Denison, in the Freemasons' Tavern, "and begin with the Archbishops, and what do you see? Why, you see what frantic efforts are being made to put us down." "As men wise in God," pursues St. Ignatius, "submitting to him [the bishop]; yet not to him, but to the Father of Jesus Christ, the Bishop of all." "It was the bishops," rejoins the Rev. Mr. Blenkinsopp, at the same meeting, "who had set the first example of *anomia* [lawlessness]: and it was not for them to lay that sin to the charge of Mr. Tooth." (Cheers from the meeting.)\* "Inasmuch," St. Ignatius reflects, "as ye are subject to the Bishop, as to Jesus Christ, you seem to me to be living, not according to man, but according to Jesus Christ." But Mr. Blenkinsopp sternly waives from himself all claim to such approval. "When the Bishop of Rochester," he continues, "went down to Hatcham, he did not go as Bishop. He went by the command of Lord Penzance: and thus he put himself into the dignified position of a bailiff or tipstaff of the noble lord." (Cheers.)

I do not willingly quote this vulgar abuse; nor need I refer to the larger selection which might have been made from anonymous writers to the same effect, or more. It is not pleasant reading to look through the leading articles and correspondence of high church newspapers, just now. My simple object is to show how the system called Ritualism, so far from being promoted by the bishops of the Established Church, is distinctly in opposition to them, and, it must be added, in rebellion. Now, a school of thought and of action that is opposed to the constituted authorities of the body it professes to belong to: what shall we say of it? What will it produce? It must needs produce confusion, disturbance, ill-will, and, if powerful enough, disruption. The body corporate, under such conditions,

\* Meeting of the Church Union, Freemasons' Tavern. *Church Times*, January 19, 1877.



will either burst asunder, like the great dragon in Babylon ; or the stronger party will expel the weaker, by some coercive measure or crucial test, or by making their community too hot to hold them. But what of a religious body, under the like conditions ? Then the aspect of things is graver indeed ; both by reason of the serious consequences to individual belief, and because the subordination under which the rebellious minority is held, possesses, or is supposed to possess, a sanction more awful.

And such is the present case. These clerical orators, whose words no one would willingly quote, each of them, in what they believed the most solemn moment of their lives, when, if ever, a want of truthfulness approaches to the nature of a sacrilege, and is something very like a lie spoken to the Holy Ghost, have made the following answers. The questions to which they answered, were put to them by him whom they believed capable, and he alone capable, of conveying to them the supernatural powers of the priesthood. They came deliberately before him in his Cathedral. It was after the Ember days, when devout souls belonging to their religion had been praying, and some of them fasting and afflicting themselves, that a special effusion of the Holy Spirit might be upon the candidates and their act. Before the *Veni Creator* was intoned, and the supposed commission given, "Now," said the bishop, "that this present congregation of Christ here assembled may also understand your minds and wills in these things, and that this your promise may the more move you to do your duties, ye shall answer plainly to these things, which we, in the name of God, and of his Church, shall demand of you touching the same."\* Would not a thrill of fear have possessed the heart of any one of the candidates for the priesthood, there standing or kneeling before his Bishop—successor, as he deemed, of the Apostles—would not his cheek have blanched, and his voice faltered in his answer, if by some prophetic spirit he could have foreseen the hour when he should stand in the Freemason's Tavern, and say, of that Apostolic authority, that he was a tipstaff and a bailiff ; that he (himself, the ordained) would resist his most frantic efforts to put him down ; that he was a traitor in lawn, and

\* Office for the Ordering of Priests, &c. Common Prayer Book.

a leader of lawlessness, and a sight not very pleasant to look at?

To appreciate this the more, we must pursue the questions and answers made at his ordination. After this solemn adjuration, the Bishop proceeds: "Will you then give your faithful diligence always so to minister the doctrine and sacraments, and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and realm hath received the same?" Now, how have the Church and realm of England received the mode of ministering doctrine, sacraments, and discipline? The answer to this would involve repeating the two former lectures *in extenso*. What does history say, what do formularies say? What about doctrine:—priest, altar, sacrifice, confession, images? What about sacraments:—reservation, adoration of a (supposed) Presence; or sacramentals—as they would say—confirmation, penance, and in some cases, extreme unction? What about discipline? Are not they who are called Ritualists, instead of the "faithful diligence" with which they have promised to minister all these things in a certain prescribed way—are they not known to give very great and *unfaithful* diligence to minister them all in another and incompatible way? What, then, in their eyes, is the value of their ordination vows?

But there is yet another question and answer, which hardly needs note or comment. The Bishop proceeds; "Will you reverently obey your ordinary, and other chief ministers, unto whom is committed the charge and government over you; following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions, and submitting yourselves to their godly judgments?" *Answer*: "I will do so, the Lord being my helper." Then shall the Bishop, standing up, say: "Almighty God, who hath given you *this will do all these things*, grant also unto you strength and power to perform the same: that He may accomplish His work that He hath begun in you; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen." Here is the solemn promise, under its two heads: godly admonitions to be followed, godly judgments to be submitted to. The Ritualist clergy now deny the minor premiss. The present admonitions and judgments, they say, are not godly, but the very reverse. I answer: then,

seek a godlier. Remain, and submit, or go forth, and be free. Do not sit down by the waters of Babylon, and weep over your harps: do not fill the streets and temples of Babylon with unavailing, rebellious cries, when the road to Jerusalem lies open, and when your return from captivity demands but an effort of your will. "How long do you halt between two sides?" If your Church be a Church, then obey the prelates set over you in the Lord. If you cannot believe in them, as indeed you have no reason, then can you have no confidence in the Church they represent. Alas! So great is the force of habit, and the *vis inertia*, and the want even of consecutive reasoning, that I may complete the text I have half quoted, about the prophet Elias—"And the people did not answer him a word."

This may be the place for introducing some notice of a recent mission.\* It only comes under review in its relation to the bishops. Otherwise, no Catholic would have an unkind or adverse feeling to such a proceeding, in its general aspect. Whatever tends to awaken men out of sloth and sin has, considered in itself, a two-fold good; it diminishes the amount of evil, and of offence against Almighty God, which unhappily is rife on every side, and it disposes the souls of those who are thus improved, for the reception of the true faith. The converts to Catholicity whom we have the happiness of receiving, belong to several classes. Some are attracted by the intrinsic beauty and harmony of the Church's doctrinal statements. Some are drawn to inquire into the truth of the strong things they have heard said against her, and to examine the other side. And not a few have gained the first steps of conversion to the faith in consequence of an improvement in themselves, derived from other sources. Such "revivals," then, and excitements, though in some ways manifestly dangerous without Catholic safeguards, may lead souls, as through a dark avenue, or tumultuous sea, to their true home. We must except from this favourable view, all that is said or done there, regarding confession and spiritual direction. On that point, the words of Scripture do distinctly apply: "I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran." No one of us can be surprised to hear of the indignation expressed

\* At Bournemouth.

in public meetings, not always in measured language, at the assumption of this most difficult office by those so untrained to its due exercise. I think "Paterfamilias" is quite right in his uneasiness, and I see no reason for not saying so. He would not commit those whom he tenderly loves in, cases of physical malady and necessity for treatment, to the untrained and therefore unskilful hands of one whose knowledge of surgery must needs be superficial. Now it has been said, and I hope truly, for I have said it in print,\* "What the surgeon is in the physical order, the priest is in the spiritual. Rather, the priest has a science and an office as much more responsible, delicate, and needful than the other's, as the soul is more precious than the body, and the grace of God more than bodily health or life. There is a most true proverb, that the surgeon should have 'an eagle's eye, a lion's heart, and a lady's hand.' And this, in a higher and better sense, is what the careful, prayerful study of moral theology tends to make the confessor."

Yes; "the careful, prayerful study." But what of those who cannot have received any sufficient training? The Catholic clergy are educated under the eye of their Bishops: they have their years of severe theological training, which, to those who undertake to give these missions, were entirely lacking. Cases would meet these well-meaning practitioners, during the first few hours of their conference with the subjects of their ministrations: complicated relations (let us suppose) arising out of sins against justice: or others, again, in which they might go yet more fatally wrong. Their antecedents, I say it without unkindness, prepare them to meet and determine such anxious difficulties, about as much as the capabilities of the man who offered, during the sudden indisposition of the first violin at a concert, to supply his place, without previous acquaintance with the instrument. Not to go into further questions of great and harassing responsibility, more difficult to deal with in speech or thought, I cannot but record the feeling, that, with regard to such well-intentioned but untrained practitioners, without diploma, without adequate knowledge or traditionary rules of procedure or judgment, "Paterfamilias" is in the right of it.

\* *Confession to a Priest.* Burns and Oates, London.

What shall we say, again, of the vows, made to themselves, which these self-appointed confessors are said to lay on their penitents, or allow them to take? They form, perhaps, one of the most anxious features of a system which certainly has its anxious as well as its grotesque point of view. Here you have silken cords, indeed, but they conceal a band of iron. I can hardly agree with Mr. Maskell, that "the practice of confession, insisted on by Dr. Pusey and his followers, and their pretended absolutions, may allowably provoke little more than a smile, mixed with a strong feeling of sincere pity for the many really pious and well-meaning people whom they mislead." The strong feeling of sincere pity, I share to the full. As to the smile, I own, that fades into something more akin to indignation. I am not speaking vaguely in comparing the mildness and gentle encouragement of the Church, true mother of her children, with the rigorism of these self-constituted guides. I take up their questions for self-examination and preparation for confession. It is like a book on surgery by one who is trying his prentice hand. It is the vivisection of souls and consciences. God preserve all for whose welfare I am concerned, from such unavailing torture. And, as to vows, let any one who is competent to speak, tell us how slow and cautious every true confessor would be in permitting any vow whatsoever, and how often in the experience of priests who have heard confessions for years, they have permitted—I will not even suppose, suggested—that a penitent should take a vow of obedience to themselves.

This, it may be said, is a digression. It is indeed so: but, the subject being of no small importance, I trust to be forgiven. And now to our point again. How does the bishop appear on this platform? What relation has he to the mission? If we may trust the accuracy of an account of the proceedings, which has been given to the world, in (I must say it) a very worldly spirit,\* the bishop was hardly cognisant of what was contemplated and carried out. Now, I deprecate, most sincerely, the tone of what I am going to quote: and I take it simply as the witness of an outsider, a man of the world, and writing (it would seem) with some personal knowledge of place and circumstance.

\* *Vanity Fair*, February 10, 1877. Digitized by Google

His words are his words, not mine ; and I disclaim sympathy with the spirit of them.

"At last, the day arrives, and with it the bishop, who has been prevailed upon to deliver an address, and to inaugurate the proceedings. This the worthy man does, with many commonplace remarks, an admonition to the clergy against over-excitement, and a copious lunch at the vicarage or rectory. The only incident worthy of remark during the prelate's visit is, that *sundry illegal practices and forbidden articles of wearing apparel are temporarily disconnected from the service of the parish church*. His departure"—not his approving smile, his apostolical blessing, or exhortation to spend and be spent in the cause—"is the signal for the breaking of the storm of sacerdotal zeal." I have hesitated to quote a further sentence, because I earnestly deprecate satire, except so far as the mere statement of what is incongruous may be left to fall by its own weight. The incongruous must needs always have a comic aspect : and something may be conceded to a layman, and a writer accustomed, no doubt, to witness high comedy on a larger stage than Chapelborough.\* He shall speak for himself. "Occasionally the missionaries, uncanny individuals in cassocks, and at some distance liable to be mistaken for aged members of the weaker sex, may be seen flitting about, as the hours of refreshment approach." And, what is more important, after the sermons "slips of paper are distributed ...inviting the guilty to commit their misdeeds to writing [I think this *must* be a mistake] and the friendly care of the mission priest." What he goes on to say about confession is included, in effect, in what I have said already ; besides, I do not like the tone of it.

Were the Catholic Church to occupy, in any given place in England, a position as dominant as the Anglican, our habitual confessions and periodical missions would never elicit, from this writer or any kindred spirit, a word of comment in the same tone. Why? Because every one knows we are at home in these things ; that they are our life, and, to use an unworthy word, our profession : that our Bishops, when they come and take part in our missions, do not "speak commonplaces," but proceed in a business-

\* The name given to Bournemouth in the article referred to.

like way to give us faculties to hear the confessions of all who present themselves : that we have at such times unusually large faculties, to meet the unusual cases which that time of grace brings to us in great numbers ; that, without such jurisdiction communicated to us from the bishop, we might hear confessions from morning till night, and not give one valid absolution ; again, that, far from "sundry illegal practices and forbidden articles of wearing apparel" being put aside during our Bishop's visit, we bring out our best things for him, and only wish they were better. In a word, every man of sense in England, including some of rather little sense, knows that we are honestly carrying out the wishes, and the express injunctions, of our Bishop, co-operating with him as his dependents and subordinates, in his responsible work in his diocese, as we have derived from him alike, though separately, orders and jurisdiction.

In pursuance of our subject, I now ask, more broadly, What is a Catholic's feeling about the bishops of the Established Church ? The English bishops seem to me just what we should expect from their position and their spiritual ancestry ; neither much less, nor much more : on the whole, rather more. They are favourable reproductions of Parker and his immediate descendants, and definitely better than others on that line of over three hundred years. There is not one of them, perhaps, or was not, in the last generation, who would have subscribed to the doctrine of Barlow, the supposed consecrator of Parker, formerly quoted to you. Not one of those who occupied the Bench, when I owed allegiance to them, would have declared, as Barlow did, that if the Sovereign, as head of the Church, "did choose, denominate, and elect any layman (being learned) to be a bishop," the person so chosen would thereby be "as good a bishop as any in England." Again, there is not a bishop on the Anglican bench against whose personal character a suspicion has been breathed. They have that measured, stately kindness, that upright bearing, grave and decorous enjoyment of the good things of this life, and handsome dispensing of palatial hospitalities, which their lordly position as peers of the realm would lead us to expect. But take them in the supernatural sphere ;

how poor and how impotent do they then show ! Their office and their aim, alike, is not so much to declare, as to navigate. They have to trim the sails, to watch the currents, to avoid the shoals. Like the bishops on a chess-board, they can but move at an angle of forty-five degrees : that is the condition under which they are placed on the board. As long as they can keep things going fairly well, they are naturally shy of definitions. They love, above all things, a safe avoidance of dogmatic truth. Aye ; *safe* : that is the word. "Safe" men, "safe" measures, are their *beau ideal* ; and, I repeat, small blame to them, either : for "the wisdom that is from above," according to the Apostle, though first pure, is then peaceable. As, from unhappy circumstances, they cannot have a wisdom that is pure, and as their system, from the first, has been largely intermixed with earth, by all means let them secure the next best thing, the practical adjustment that is peaceable.

But then, this view of things, and this aim in conduct, must always have two great disadvantages.

(1) It is unable to conciliate the respect, or win the confidence, of any man earnest for the integrity of Divine truth. Their whole view proclaims a system of compromise, and themselves as dispensers of it. But compromise is a human thing, not a Divine. It never can enter into a Divine system of religious teaching ; for that is concerned with revelation, and revelation is trenchant, pure, and exclusive. It excludes the opposite, or the contradictory, as light dispels darkness. In human systems, men may fairly demand to live at peace, and for the sake of that happy result, may well give up a part of their convictions or predilections : they may waive questions, and concede definitions, tone down strong assertions, and meet their neighbours half way. He would be morose, unsocial, uncharitable, who would not do thus much. Not so in Divine truth. "Here now it is required among the dispensers [of the mysteries of God] that a man be found faithful." He cannot tamper ; he cannot give up, or explain away, or soften, or "economise." Here, to be "safe" is, in truth, to endanger : to endanger what ought to be dearer to him than life ; the definite outlines and sharp edges of revelation. To be "liberal" is for a servant to give away



the property of his Master, and that Master the Lord of truth. If only the Church of those bishops were true, then to adopt their line of policy would be fatal. Under existing circumstances, it seems to me very prudent and wise. If their Church were true, their inevitable language would be that of Archdeacon Denison, a straightforward, unreasoning man. "You seem to forget," he says, writing to a newspaper,\* "that there are some things which no school of the Church may sell at any price, or under any fear of consequence." Again: "We may not, therefore, give way—no, not by a hair's breadth." This is unmistakable language: and would have sense in it, if, in fact, his Church had ever troubled herself about "hair's breadths." Her breadth has always been much broader.

(2) The second great disadvantage of the whole position and tone of the Anglican bishops, is this: that when people apply to them for advice, especially for dogmatic instruction, they have none to give. It is not for the purpose of saying anything discourteous, but merely recording what the future historian will discover in the records of our time, if I refer again to that passage in the prophet about those who cannot bark. I can enter into the feelings of Ritualists, both clergy and laity, regarding their bishops: but I affirm, that the cause of this distressing silence, or impotence of speech, in the Episcopal body, is to be sought, not in the nineteenth, but in the sixteenth century. *Roma locuta est, causa finita est*: was the old rule. When the voice of Rome ceased to be heard in England, there was nothing to replace it, but utterances from the Throne.

Let us take a few examples of episcopal reticence, or faculty of speaking on the wrong side.

(a) The other day, a new church at Kennington was to be consecrated, according to the best of the abilities of the Bishop of London. Rumours, not unfounded ones, had reached him, that some arrangements in the church went beyond what was authorised by the Anglican system. The archdeacon was therefore sent to inspect the building. Meanwhile, an aggrieved parishioner writes to the Bishop, detailing the observances carried on at a temporary church, as being similar to those already condemned at Hatcham;

\* *Standard*, February 24, 1877. Digitized by Google

and adding: "I was informed that when the new church is opened, additions will be made to the ritual." Now, here is a direct appeal to the Bishop, as spiritual father (supposed), and on a matter which no one could deem unimportant. The bishop, indeed, acknowledged its importance, not only by sending to see, but by actually removing what he thought objectionable; as I said in the last lecture. He took the Mother of his Redeemer out of the window. Yet what account does he give of his own general powers, in answer to the aggrieved parishioner? "My consecration of the church, which is simply my duty," [surely not, if there is anything in it that Articles and Homilies would protest against], "gives no sanction whatever to the character of the service which may be carried on in it afterwards. The incumbent will be subject to the law and its penalties, if he disobeys it; and I have not the right to require any further guarantee." Does he mean, right given him by Cæsar, or necessity laid on him by God? "If the statements in your letter are correct, *it is to be hoped* that no such practices may ever be in use in the new church." And thus the bishop shelves the parishioner. This is all the satisfaction that an inquirer can get, who applies to a supposed spiritual authority, and is referred back to a temporal law.

(b) We will make a short journey into the past, and find ourselves in the year 1850, when Mr. Maskell, still an Anglican clergyman, applies to Dr. Sumner, Archbishop of Canterbury, to know what he has the authority of the Anglican Church to teach his people. He addresses him in his capacity as Archbishop of the Province, asking what doctrines he ought to teach on the authority of the Church of England; and he specifies several of great importance, regarding the Sacraments. "These subjects, my Lord," he says, "I consider to be intimately connected with the foundations of religious faith; and, according as they are believed, with the daily life and practice of every Christian man. It is impossible, I suppose, that the Church of Christ should have left them undetermined. My perplexity is the greater, because of the increased ambiguity which has lately been thrown upon our doctrinal formularies." Now, the Archbishop was a man of great personal worth and kindness: and

certainly, if he had had anything to say, to the purpose, every feeling would have moved him to say it. But, in replying, he merely says: "I disclaim all right to answer authoritatively, or assume a responsibility which does not belong to the office I hold." Then he proceeds, under each head of inquiry, simply to quote Scripture and Articles, which the inquirer, of course, had equally in his hands; and that, without a word of comment, except that no more is revealed. He leaves his correspondent as much in the dark as before, on the ground that "the secret things belong to the Lord our God." On a second and more pressing application, the Archbishop answers, that the inquirer, at his ordination, had received "authority to preach the word of God;" and winds up, or rather, waives the whole, by saying: "Now, whether the doctrines concerning which you inquire are contained in the word of God, and can be proved thereby, *you have the same means of discovering as myself, and I have no special authority to declare.*"

This correspondence produced a letter from the Bishop of Exeter to the same clergyman, who was his chaplain and personal friend. "I must frankly say," the Bishop affirms, "that I think your main position untenable; that every sound branch of the Catholic Church is bound to have dogmatic teaching on the particulars stated by you." Those particulars, observe, were, Baptismal Regeneration and Justification; the gift of the Holy Ghost in Confirmation; Apostolical Succession and Orders; and the priestly power to absolve others beside intending communicants, and the sick. "Unnecessary," says the Bishop of Exeter, "to have dogmatic teaching on these particulars." And then he proceeds to blow hot and cold over the whole subject, so as only a man of his diplomatic ability could do, without being ludicrous on the very surface. Neither prelate, though their special manner of dealing with the subject made them very unlike each other, could say anything to comfort or reassure a doubtful mind.

(c) Let us go back yet further, to the time when the "Tracts" began first to make themselves felt. You will see still the same episcopal discouragement of the so-called Catholic revival, which is a part of the general negativeness

and "safeness" of their spirit. Here I will borrow the words of one who, of all others, is entitled to speak of the early stages of that period. "Soon," says Dr. Newman,\* "the living rulers of the Establishment began to move. There are those who . . . are wont to shrink from the contumacious, and to be valiant towards the submissive; and the authorities in question gladly availed themselves of the power conferred on them by the movement, against the movement itself. They fearlessly handselled their Apostolic weapons upon the Apostolical party. One after another, in long succession, they took up their song and their parable against it. It was a solemn war-dance, which they executed round victims, who by their very principles were bound hand and foot, and could only eye, with disgust and perplexity, this most unaccountable movement, on the part of their 'holy Fathers,' the representatives of the Apostles, and the Angels of the Churches. It was the beginning of the end."

In an earlier passage, Dr. Newman had told us how mistaken was this new-born school of thought, in supposing that either it was strengthening the hands of the bishops, or would be encouraged by them. "These men understood the nature of the Church far better than they understood the nature of the religious communion which they sought to defend. They saw in that religion, indeed, a contrariety to their Apostolical principles, but they seem to have fancied that such contrariety was an accident in its constitution, and was capable of a cure. They did not understand that the Established religion was set up in Erastianism, that Erastianism was its essence, and that to destroy Erastianism was to destroy the religion. The movement, then, and the Establishment, were in simple antagonism from the first, although neither party knew it; they were logical contradictories; they could not be true together; what was the life of the one was the death of the other. The sole ambition of the Establishment was to be the creature of statesmen; the sole aspiration of the movement was to force it to act for itself. Every breath, every sigh, every aspiration, every effort of the movement was an affront or an offence to the Establishment. In its very first Tract, it

\* *Lectures on Anglican Difficulties*, p. 133, 4th edition.

could wish nothing better for the Bishops of the Establishment than martyrdom : and, as the very easiest escape, it augured for them the loss of their temporal possessions. It was easy to foresee what response the Establishment would make to its officious defenders, as soon as it could recover from its surprise ; but experience was necessary to teach this to men who knew more of St. Athanasius than of the Privy Council or the Court of Arches."

Accordingly, "A first Episcopal charge replies [to some high doctrine enunciated in a 'Tract for the Times'] in the words of the Homily : 'Let us diligently search the well of life, and not run after the stinking puddles of tradition, devised by man's imagination.' A second : 'It is a subject of deep concern that any of our body should prepare men of ardent feelings and warm imaginations for a return to the Roman Mass-book.' And a third : 'Already are the foundations of apostasy laid ; if we once admit another Gospel, Antichrist is at the door. I am full of fear ; everything is at stake ; there seems to be something judicial in the rapid spread of these opinions.' And a fourth : 'It is impossible not to remark upon the subtle wile of the adversary ; it has been signally and unexpectedly exemplified in the present day, by the revival of errors which might have been supposed buried for ever.' And a fifth : 'Under the spurious pretence of deference to antiquity and respect for primitive models, the foundations of our Protestant Church are undermined by men who dwell within her walls, and those who sit in the Reformer's seat are traducing the Reformation.' 'Our glory is in jeopardy,' says a sixth. 'Why all this tenderness for the very centre and core of corruption?' asks a seventh. 'Among other marvels of the present day,' says an eighth, 'may be accounted the irreverent and unbecoming language applied to the chief promoters of the Reformation in this land.' 'Reunion with Rome has been rendered impossible,' says a ninth ; 'yet I am not without hope that more cordial union may, in time, be effected among all Protestant Churches.' 'Most of the Bishops,' says a tenth, 'have spoken in terms of disapproval of the "Tracts for the Times," and I certainly believe the system to be most pernicious, and one which is calculated to produce the most

lamentable schism in a Church already fearfully disunited.' 'Up to this moment,' says an eleventh, 'the movement is advancing under just the same pacific professions, and the same imputations are still cast upon all who in any way impede its progress. Even the English Bishops, who have officially expressed any disapprobation of the principles or proceedings of the party, have not escaped such animadversions' (a remark that undoubtedly may be applied to later times also). Finally: 'Tractarianism is the master-piece of Satan,' says a twelfth.

"But there was a judgment more cruel still, because it practically told in [the Tractarians'] favour; but it was the infelicity of the agents in the movement, that, the National Church feeling both in its rulers and its people as it did, their teaching could not escape animadversion, except at the expense of their principles. 'A Bishop's lightest word, *ex cathedra*, is heavy,' said a writer of the 'Tracts for the Times.' And an Archbishop (I suppose Dr. Whateley) answered from the other side of St. George's Channel, 'Many persons look with considerable interest to the declarations on such matters that from time to time are put forth by Bishops in their Charges, or on other occasions. But on most of the points to which I have been alluding, a Bishop's declarations have no more weight, except what they derive from his personal character, than any anonymous pamphlet would have. The points are mostly such as he has no official power to decide, even in reference to his own diocese; and as to legislation for the Church, or authoritative declarations on many of the most important matters, neither any one Bishop, nor all collectively, have any more right of this kind, than the ordinary magistrates have to take on themselves the functions of Parliament.'"\*

This certainly is suicidal doctrine. You remember, perhaps, a picture by Hogarth. A man who, from political hatred of royalty, is bent upon sawing through the beam that supports the sign of "the Crown," has seated himself on the beam, and is sawing between himself and the wall. Just as the beam gives way under him, he perceives, with very natural alarm, that the fall of the sign-board will involve his own. So here. A bishop who writes that he

\* *Anglican Difficulties*, Lect. iv. pp. 93, 98. 


has no official power to decide or to declare on many important points, even for his own diocese, and that neither he, nor the whole collective Bench, can give "authoritative declarations on many of the most important matters," unbishops himself at every word. The more truly he speaks, the more false does his position show itself to be. By comparison, it is an unimportant thing to say, that such doctrine abundantly justifies the disestablishment of the Church "across St. George's Channel." For why maintain it, with its vast revenues and crying injustice, if, after all, it has no more power of moving or acting, than the ox in its master's crib? "Among those," says the present Cardinal, writing in 1864, "who listened to the debate" [on the Bishop of London's Bill to amend the Appellate Jurisdiction] "there was one to whom Lord Brougham's speech suggested one more question. 'Suppose that all the Bishops of the Church of England should decide unanimously on any doctrine, would anyone receive the decision as infallible?' No one." And further: "To those who believed that God has established upon the earth a divine, and, therefore, an infallible guardian and teacher of His Faith, this event demonstrated the Church of England could not be that guardian and teacher." "Either all appeals must be settled within the four seas, or they must be carried beyond them; that is, the Church of England has no choice for its final appeal but the Crown or the Holy See. The attraction by which it adheres to the Crown is proportioned to the repulsion by which it flies from the Holy See. And the consciousness of this fact has made it subside and acquiesce under the royal supremacy, as the shelter and blind to conceal the untenableness of its position: for the common sense of Englishmen would refuse to submit in appeal, on matters of faith, to the judgment of a bench of bishops who disclaim infallibility, and are openly divided against themselves."\*

Pledged, as the English clergy are, to obey such unsatisfactory bishops, it is not to be supposed they have invented no theory to excuse their manifest and even contemptuous disobedience. A high-church organ states the difficulty fairly enough, whatever weight may be given to its answer.

\* *England and Christendom*. "The Crown in Council on the Essays and Reviews, pp. 9, 11, 12."

"The attitude of resistance," it says, "towards the Episcopate, into which the whole active section of the High Church school has moved of late years, naturally provokes much comment, and some sarcasm, from critics of other parties. They allege—and there is a considerable show of truth in it—that high churchmen, while professing the highest respect and devotion for the episcopal office in the abstract, are more frequently in open conflict with the concrete individual diocesan than men of the other two sections are found to be. And the conclusion drawn from this fact is, that the theoretical champion of Apostolical Succession is in practice a rank Presbyterian or Independent: and that his only notion of voluntarily obeying a bishop is, that the bishop should first obey him, or at any rate the leaders of the High Church School, and thus merely tell him to do what he is already willing and anxious to do. Failing that, he obeys only just so far as the coercive jurisdiction of the ordinary extends; that is, he does whatever can be enforced in a court of law, and no more. This condition of things is, to say the least of it, seemingly abnormal and inconsistent."\* It is so, indeed: and I must add that the writer of the article seems to me, in his statement, to be one of those unskilful magicians, who raise a more powerful spirit than they are afterwards able to quell.

A more systematic defence of this great anomaly, I find in a pamphlet, lately published, entitled "The Disobedience of the Clergy." It is a letter to the Bishop of Lichfield, by a clergyman in his diocese. The line of argument may be summed up in an epigram, which the writer repeats under various forms; it is this. Whereas, at what he names the Réformation, they who remained obedient to Rome sacrificed truth to obedience, on the other hand, they who "revolted" against the claims of the Papacy, sacrificed obedience to truth. He carries on and applies the same epigrammatic contrast, into the present state of Anglicanism. To remain submissive to Bishops, whom he assumes (the assumption we dealt with last week) to be unconstitutionally submissive to the State—this, according to him, is sacrificing truth to obedience. To oppose the Bishops, and especially the Archbishop of Canterbury, who

\* *Church Times*, Feb. 9, 1877. 




"invoked the aid of Parliament to assist in reducing the clergy to obedience," this is to sacrifice obedience to truth. Here are two large instances of that time-honoured mode of argument; begging the question. The writer first begs it to be assumed that the original revolt was a justifiable revolt, and in favour of the truth. We must not quarrel with him, individually, for that: it is the tradition of his elders. But he thereupon goes on to beg, that the points on which the clergy now disobey their bishops are not only points of vital truth, but points on which the bishops are wrong, and the inferior clergy right. How easily might the bishops answer: "We coerce you, and call in the State to help us, because you are so wrong, and so manifestly against your engagements, that vigour is more our duty than lenity. The revolt of which you speak, the Reformation, did more than sacrifice obedience to truth: it sacrificed all ecclesiastical appeal, except to ourselves. It moreover constituted a supreme and final lay appeal, in the Crown. The revolt was a transfer of jurisdiction. You cannot plead to enjoy immunity from the ecclesiastical supremacy of Rome, and then vaunt your independence of that supremacy which has taken its place. You cannot be neither for Tiara nor for Crown. If your third option be our mitres, behold, we cast them into the scale against you. We, your Right Rev. fathers, are content with the Canons and Articles and Oaths which we have subscribed and sworn, and which you have subscribed and sworn before us. It is yours to keep them, as well as to subscribe and swear: else, in spite of our efforts to keep you, and we have sacrificed something of our views and tastes to do so, you must go forth; you must form a community of your own: and mind you call it the sect of the *Acephali*." Such would be the language of good sense on the part of the Bishops.

This pamphlet may be taken as a representative utterance. The writer acknowledges, of course, that it is far better to have obedience and truth together, where you can; and then he assumes, as a minor premiss, that in these contentions the Ritualist clergy are right, and the bishops are wrong. Sometimes (according to him), the bishops have taken the initiative in a movement, where they had truth, and so could lawfully command obedience:

but the instances have not terminated happily. Laud was beheaded, Sancroft and the other non-juring bishops were set aside, and their party came to an end. "From that time," he says, "with but few exceptions, the initiative in all reforms has come from below. The history of the Church [he means, I suppose, the Church of England] for the last fifty years, amply bears out this assertion." Whatever becomes of English history, the history of the Church at large is against him, as well as principle. Principle; for hear St. Cyprian: "I bring these things forward with sorrow, forasmuch as you [Papianus] set yourself up as the judge of God and of Christ, who says to the Apostles, and thereby to all prelates who succeed to the Apostles by an ordination that represents them (*vicaria ordinatione*): '*He that heareth you, heareth Me.*' For schisms and heresies have arisen from this; when the bishop, who is one, and presides over a Church, is contemned by the proud presumption of individuals; and the man honoured by God as worthy, is by men judged unworthy."\* And Catholic history is against him; inasmuch as all reforms and promulgations, all Canons, whether of doctrine or discipline, have always come from the Bishops, as the initiative and legislative body. They have the province, whether to define or to enforce. In proof of this, look at the Councils of Trent, or of the Vatican, or any previous instance of the assemblies of the Church.

It is, indeed, one of the greatest condemnations of the Anglican establishment, that (as this writer says) those of its bishops who went upon a higher line, have come to grief. But such is the constitution of things: *Le roi le veut*. And thus, when he adds: "I may state it as an unquestionable fact, that the manifest improvements of the last fifty years have been carried out for the most part in opposition to the wishes of the Episcopate," he signs and seals the death-warrant of the catholicity of that system to which he belongs. It is as though he should come forward, and say: "I strenuously assert ourselves to be a true branch of the Catholic Church, and now I give you the most cogent reasons why we are not, and cannot be." The more he proves his system to be unepiscopal, the less can he possibly assert it to be Catholic.

\* Epist. lxix. ad Fl. Papianum. 

St. Ignatius, the spokesman of the Patristic theology, is as much against him on the one side, as the Canons, with their excommunications of "his wicked errors," on the other. Such is the fate of a sect, or indeed of any compromise or negation, in the presence of systems more positive and consistent :

'Tis dangerous, when the weaker nature comes  
Between the thrust, and full incensed points  
Of mighty opposites.

A compromise in religious teaching is both self-condemned by the very term, and exposed to a cross-fire from either side. Like the bat among the rest of the animal creation, it is flown at by the cat for a mouse, and pounced upon by the hawk as being a bird. This particular phase of religious thought clings to episcopacy, while it loathes and contemns its bishops ; and rejects the papacy, though it would give anything to have a Pope of its own. No wonder that the author of "The Disobedience of the Clergy" should add, as he does with much simplicity : "This imperfection of our Church has been a sore trial to many among us."

We will now take Henry of Exeter on the subject of Confession, and must partly go over ground already trodden. Here you have a practice springing up in Anglicanism, certainly not promoted by the Bishops, and regarded with a great amount of dislike and fear among heads of families : the practice of auricular confession. At first sight, it seems to be encouraged by the Prayer-book ; but to what extent ? (1) There is the exhortation, before Communion, to those who, having examined themselves, and being unable to quiet their own consciences, require further comfort and counsel. These are to "come to me," says the Minister, "or to some other discreet and learned minister of God's word, and open their grief : that by the ministry of God's holy word [a very vague expression indeed] he may receive the benefit of absolution," and the rest. (2) The sick person visited by the Priest is to be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feels his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. "After which confession, the priest shall absolve him," in a form prescribed. And then, singularly enough, after the absolution given, the Priest says a prayer for his penitent, who most "earnestly

*desireth* pardon and forgiveness"; an anomaly which must be left to those most concerned, to explain.

The late Bishop of Exeter, having confuted the Dean of his Cathedral, who had preached that confession and absolution were (apparently in any case) essentially Popish and unscriptural, next turns him to the Rev. Mr. Prynne.\* This clergyman had been complained of, for asserting that "the Church of England does not *discourage* the general habit of confession;" and had challenged his special opponent (Mr. Nantes) to show that the Church of England does discourage this practice, "by some authoritative statement in some of her authorised documents." The Bishop remarks:

"Our Church, so far as I recollect, nowhere says anything expressly, which recognises such a practice, whether to encourage or discourage it. But, on the other hand, in the exhortation to be used in giving warning of communion, it assumes that persons in general may be expected to satisfy themselves of the sincerity and fulness of their repentance, by 'examining their lives and conversation by the rule of God's commandments'—and it is only 'if there be any who cannot, *by this means*, quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further counsel and advice,' that the Church recommends special confession to a priest. In short, the Church earnestly impresses on the party *the duty of doing all that he can himself* in the way of self-examination, self-judgment, self-correction; and it is only when he has himself done all that he can towards quieting his own conscience *in vain*, that he is instructed to have recourse to private confession and absolution. In my opinion, this is virtually to discourage the general habit; for such general habit would seem to show, either that the party adopting it did never honestly and earnestly strive to do all that he can for himself—or that, having once received private absolution, he is so unstable, so light-minded, so utterly incapable of all self-control, that, after such absolution, he is continually relapsing into sin—and sin of such malignity, that he cannot of himself attain (by the ordinary grace of God) to due repentance. Surely we must believe that such cases,

\* *Confession and Absolution*: a letter to the Dean of Exeter, with Appendix. London, 1852. The present lecture was delivered before those recent and distressing agitations on the subject, which will admit of only one termination—a compromise.

if there be any such, are very rare." "I say therefore, now, as I have more than once publicly said before, as well as privately told my candidates for holy orders, that the Church of England appears to me to 'discourage confession as a general habit.'"

A little below, the Bishop refers to a previous pastoral letter of his own, which "condemned the habit of going to confession as a part of the ordinary discipline of a Christian life." "I even stated," he says, "in the same place, that I had warned a clergyman, who had himself incited a party to have recourse to confession before him, not being within either of the two cases where it is prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer—I had, I say, warned this clergyman to abstain from a course which seems ill-accordant with the teaching and mind of our Church."\* Then, in answer to Mr. Prynne, who still urges his point, the Bishop, taking an oblique direction, like the bishop in chess, concludes: "As I do not think that the Church of England prohibits your receiving to confession those who seek it as an habitual practice, I do not presume to prohibit your doing so. I should endeavour to dissuade one who came to me in pursuance of the practice, from persisting to desire it." [There is no doubt that the Bishop would have complete success.] "If I had sufficient reason to believe that he had not endeavoured honestly and earnestly to quiet his own conscience by self-examination and other acts of repentance, I should not myself admit him. More than this I must decline saying." Well may a writer whom I have already quoted, exclaim: "We do not want *permissions* to think truly: we want *commands*. Nay, more: we want commands not to think error. One side or the other; only, no more compromise; no more interpretation; we have groaned under that burden long enough."†

Now, it may be said of Henry of Exeter that he was no more infallible in his pastoral advice than Cranmer in his Homilies. True; but I quote him because of all the English bishops he was one of the ablest, as he was perhaps the highest in Church opinions, and one of the most outspoken. Yet you see how he glides between two opinions.

\* *Ibid.* Appendix, pp. 39, 40.

† See the *Morality of Tractarianism*, ut supra.

Here again, therefore, the argument is *a fortiori*. If he would so discourage a practice which it is now sought to revive, and would himself absolutely refuse it in ordinary dealings with souls, what would you find, if you sought the opinion and countenance of his brethren on the bench? In other words, to come back to our text, how far is habitual, or even frequent confession and absolution promoted by the Bishops? And, as to their practice, should I not be thought derisive if I asked, whether any one was ever known to go to confession to an Anglican bishop? What clergyman, what layman, has knelt at their feet to "open his grief?" Has anyone heard the remotest whisper, that an Anglican bishop has himself confessed to any of his clergy, say, before administering the Communion, or holding ordination? And one question more, before passing from the subject. What is the measure of cruelty which you will assign to the Church of England, if her ministers *have* the power of those keys, and she as a Church, and her bishops as bishops, never insist on their using them? Why do they not exact of the clergy an account of the number of confessions heard in a year? Again: How do excellent and devoted men wear themselves out, with exemplary zeal, in their parishes, as their predecessors for generations, and live and die, without the suspicion crossing their minds that they were invested with that mighty and beneficent power? What are the bishops about, not to enforce the conviction upon them? They are sensible men, and, weighing evidence, they practically disbelieve it. Let us pursue our proof of the irreconcilable discrepancy between the ritualistic theory and the bishops.

A modern instance is more difficult to speak of, because it is nearer home. But, after all, these are not abstract truths. They are to be applied; and they aim at the disillusion of individuals. I need have no fear of being personal, in any offensive sense, while simply illustrating my thesis, that Ritualism is no true expression of the Church of Elizabeth and Parker, as that Church is represented by its true representatives—the bishops. And so I tell my story.

Not so long ago, a church was to be consecrated\* ac-

\* St. Clement's, Bournemouth. by Google

according to the best abilities of the bishop of the diocese : a man of acknowledged ability. Every Anglican bishop, as a matter of course, always does his very best on such occasions. There was a gathering of those who are interested ; and an eloquent sermon, as need hardly be said. Communion was administered, after a difficulty had been got over, as to the kind of bread to be used. The Bishop held, and he had the rubric to back him, that "to take away all occasion of contention, and superstition, which any person hath or might have concerning the Bread and Wine, it shall suffice that the Bread be such as is usual to be eaten."\* The clergy concerned, however, thought it by no means sufficed ; and presented to their bishop, for consecration, such unleavened wafers as are used in the Catholic Church. These are details : but principles are proved by details, to distinguish them from theories ; and such particulars have not been considered beneath the dignity even of national history. The bishop refused to proceed, until some ordinary bread had been procured ; and, when the clergy represented that, being Sunday, the bakers' shops were closed, bade them have some fetched from the nearest cottage.

Now here is no slight dissonance between the bishop and his clergy. Is it unimportant ? It does not affect the consecration : for that, in the hands of a true priest, is equally valid (as distinct from licit), whether the bread offered is leavened or unleavened ; it is a matter of discipline. These amiable laymen, with a lay bishop at their head, were unable to consecrate, whatever the material. But the point at issue is, sympathy with the practice of the whole West, or the absence of it : and herein, greater or less reverence towards a supposed Presence, involved in the greater or less remoteness from an article of ordinary food. "It shall suffice," says the rubric. "It shall more than suffice," thinks the bishop : "it shall be the one only permitted ; for we have to protest against the superstitions of Rome." And so the service proceeded. They came to the consecration of the elements at Communion. Nay, I am truly glad to repeat, that the bishop could but do his best. His best was not so good as his clergy would have desired. Had they had the matter in hand, not one of

\* Rubric after the Communion Service.

them but thought he could have done it better. His maximum would have been their minimum. There would have been more perception, more intention ; therefore more reverence, and care to avoid accidents. But those unhappy lawn sleeves ! If he had even had a cope on : though a cope is not much, after all, and a very awkward vestment to say Mass in.

Now, when I speak of accidents, you know, my brethren, how harrowing it would be to us, priests and laity alike, if any distressing accident should occur to the adorable elements at Mass, or in administering the Divine Eucharist. How should we search our consciences, and take the verdict of others, as to whether this had happened through fault of ours ? . It is true, that where there is no will, there is no sin : and yet we should hardly know how to forgive ourselves. A priest who, however blamelessly, should overset the chalice after consecration (I never knew it happen) would probably say a Mass of expiation, as soon as he could. A layman who, through some faulty mode of receiving, should let fall the sacred particle from his lips, would mention it in his next confession. An early Pope, St. Pius I., who lived in the time of the Antonines, decreed canons of graduated penance against a priest to whom this most distressing event should occur by any negligence of his. If the most Precious Blood should drop on the altar, the priest was to continue his penance for three days ; if on the upper altar-cloth, for four ; if on the lower, for nine. Did It penetrate to the fourth altar-cloth, then for twenty days ; and lastly, did It fall to the ground, then the penance reached to forty days. Nor is this surprising ; since the irreverence, supposing it the result of any want of care, would be so immeasurably great. Each several drop is adorable with the adoration of *latria*, as being the Blood of God the Word, assumed in the womb and from the veins of His immaculate Mother, and shed on the Cross for us men and for our salvation. And one reason, though not the chief, why the Church has restricted the chalice to the celebrant, is the fear lest an accident which, I repeat, would be so harrowing, might occur. Let us now resume the narrative.

The Bishop, then, after the supposed consecration of the elements, having spilt no small quantity of the wine



on the floor, considerably spread his pocket-handkerchief over it, to soak it up. The established church provides no rubric for such an occurrence, though she secures its probability. One of the clergy present is said to have gone down on his knees (after the bishop's departure, you will observe), and licked up what he could from the pavement. If he did, I sincerely honour him for his act, and for the motive that prompted it. Not because what he did was necessary; not that our Divine Lord and Master would have suffered any dishonour, objectively, by his omitting it; not because act, or motive, was in harmony with the religious body in which he was entangled; or encouraged by any one rubric, or canon, or episcopal charge, or religious treatise genuinely representing the establishment. On the contrary, painful pages might be read to you from the ecclesiastical history of England, as given in such High Church writers as Heylin and Collier, to show what irreverence prevailed regarding the consecrated elements, as a result of the change of religion under Edward and Elizabeth.\* They took away the hedge, by transferring men's belief from the objective to the subjective: no wonder the wild boar entered the enclosure, and trampled down those growths of reverent, adoring love which a sense of our Lord's sacramental Presence must inspire. It would be doing the Ritualists grievous injustice to ignore or undervalue the reverence they pay to their elements. I am in no danger of this; though compelled to say that such acts, in their present position, involve a terrible amount of material idolatry. If, however, their conduct were more accordant with the catholicity they profess, there is nothing in their eucharistic belief but what requires to be simply completed, elevated, purified, made consistent and real.

But to return to this act of mistaken reverence. Did the clergyman who so acted, remember, or forget, the "black rubric" which I quoted before? If he forgot it, it was, for the moment, *felix ignorantia*. If he remembered it, the remembrance must have come very painfully across his mind, as he went down on his kness. These, however, are minor issues. The chief object in view, in referring to the occurrence at all, is to show the discrepancy between the

\* See Appendix, B and C. Digitized by Google

bishop and his clergy. For the bishop, having soaked up the wine with his handkerchief ("the sacramental bread and wine remaining still in their natural substances," incapable, therefore, of an adoration, which would be "idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians"), knowing his rubrics, and the history of them, went on with the service, and presided afterwards at the luncheon with his accustomed suavity. Accidents will happen; only to be thought of when they are of importance: so, like Marmion, he

Pass'd them, as accidents of course,  
And bade his clarions sound to horse—

and departed, carrying all the tranquillity and complacency with him, and leaving all the distress, and—I must again add—misplaced reverence, behind him. A distinct act of reparation, I believe, was performed after he had gone, by the clergy, to atone for the act of their bishop. Here, then, the bishop and clergy are not one on so vital a subject as the Eucharist.

Last, not least, let us take the present Archbishop of Canterbury, for whom old associations give me a sincere personal regard. He is practically a presbyterian: but that ought rather to conciliate the good will of men who are saying the strongest things they can put into language against their bishops. Is the opinion of Archbishop Tait to go for anything? Then we possess it in abundance. It may be unfair to represent a man's opinions by an isolated saying; but the Ritualist clergy in London will not soon forget a rebuke they received from him as their bishop, when, assembling at some great celebration, they came forth, arrayed in coloured stoles. It was almost as laconic as Cromwell's "Take away that bauble." "Gentlemen," he said: "take off those ribbons." Not an encouraging utterance from one of the angels of the Churches.

So, again, in the days when Dr. Longley was bishop of Ripon, the Church of St. Saviour's at Leeds was built to represent the ritualism of that time; and inside the door was placed a large inscription: "All you who enter this holy place, pray for the sinner who built it." The bishop prudently came to see the church, before doing his best to consecrate it. He saw the inscription. "I must have that

away," he said, "before I proceed." "But, my lord," it was urged, "the benefactor is living." "True," he remarked, "but he *will die*, you know; so it must come down." And down it came. Now, here is a point which the Anglican Church has left open; people may pray for the dead, or leave it alone, according to their fancy. An open opinion, but yet too Catholic to be tolerated by a bishop. Not more unerringly does the needle seek the pole, nor water find its level, than the Anglican episcopal mind subsides and rests upon a standard represented by Cranmer, Parker, Stillingfleet, Bull, Tillotson, Van Mildert. Such names suggest a graduated scale, indeed, but the degrees range within a narrow limit of high and low. They are not so low as Hoadley, nor as high as the least in the kingdom of God.

To return to Dr. Tait. As bishop of London, he published a Charge, from which I will only give a sentence or two. "There are churches," he says, "amongst us, in which the ornaments about the Communion Table, and the dress, and attitudes, and whole manner of the officiating clergy, render it difficult for a stranger, when he enters, to know whether he is in a Roman Catholic or a Church of England place of worship." "When this is the case, the actors in these scenes are, no doubt, conscientiously, preaching by their worship a doctrine which is very dear to them; but let them remember, it is not the doctrine of the Church of which they are ministers." "To judge, indeed, by certain unauthorised catechisms and manuals of devotion, which some of the supporters of this Ritualism have already put forth, I fear they have not succeeded in this attempt to divorce Ritual ceremonial from deadly Roman errors."\*

The *catena* of Episcopal testimony seems complete. More links might have been added; but surely that has now been shown, which, by my question I engaged to show, that the ritualism which has sprung up in the Established Church is not promoted by its bishops.

To wind up and concentrate the charge which no inclination, certainly, has induced me to bring against this system, it must be put into words which I fear will be wounding, though they will not exceed what I feel to be true. "Better are the wounds of a friend, than the deceitful kisses of an

\* Charge, pp. 10, 11, 17. Digitized by Google

enemy;" and I claim, once more, to have every friendly feeling towards those who may be in preparation to become far better Catholics than I am to-day. But wounding it must be to say, as truth compels us, that what is called Ritualism labours under the threefold defect of being (1) schismatical, (2) uncatholic, (3) presbyterian.

(1.) It is schismatical; for

(a) In common with the whole English Church, it was founded in schism: and

(b) It splits off, again, from that dissevered branch, and is alien to it in its present working, and in aspirations for the future.

Founded in schism: for, even supposing a doctrine to be untrue which is most true, the supremacy, namely, by divine right, of St. Peter's successor, yet even so, the Pope is Patriarch of the West. In that capacity, he would claim the obedience of each metropolitan, every bishop, and the whole clergy of this country, as much as of France, or Spain. That divinely constituted obedience, Patriarchate, Primacy, Supremacy together, the king annulled, by transferring it to himself. Did we not see this abundantly in the first lecture? The three great evil motives of this world were all at work together to produce this result: Anne Boleyn, Church spoils, the Supremacy. Then, the schism having been accomplished, a machine was invented by that same king, and continued under his son and younger daughter. To that work of their hands they gave the name of *Ecclesia Anglicana*: a machine so clumsily put together, that the only wonder is, it should have creaked and tottered on, through as much as three centuries of time; and which is now crushing the poor Ritualists under its Juggernaut wheels. Thus we arrive at the second stage of the schism; when men, whose forefathers acquiesced in the severance of their Church from unity, have found, and fostered, all disunion within their own separation, and now speak, not unnaturally, of setting up for themselves. But a free Church is not "the liberty with which Christ hath made us free;" for He placed us under the paternal subjection implied in "He that heareth you, heareth Me." Men who rave on platforms, and elicit cheers by abusive language against those whom they have pledged themselves to obey, ought

first to ascertain the foundations on which their community has rested from its beginning. They will find that "No Popery," the first schism, brings on, inevitably, "No Penance," which is the second.

What can be more schismatical, for example, than the conduct of the Hatcham congregation, during the service conducted by their Bishop's nominee? We have to trust the reports of the public press: and one would be sincerely glad to hear that the account was somehow inaccurate or overcharged. But we read as follows. I have interwoven the details from the *Times* and the *Standard*. "The behaviour of the congregation was very unbecoming, and was referred to in severe terms by Mr. Dale in his sermon. Very few knelt; some stood during the whole service, whilst others made a point of standing where the Prayer-book enjoined them to kneel. The friends of Mr. Tooth, [are enumerated as] the boys and girls belonging to the schools, Mr. Tooth's curates and his churchwardens. These several members of the congregation read devotional books of different kinds during the service, to which they wished it to be known they were paying no attention whatever. They also made themselves conspicuous by standing when the rest of the congregation were sitting and kneeling, and by sitting while others were standing. When the Litany was finished, and while a hymn was being sung, previous to the commencement of the Communion service, they [Mr. Tooth's friends] left the church in a body, to the number of 300; their ground for doing so, as stated by one of themselves, being that the whole service was schismatic, and that they could not remain to see the Eucharist desecrated."\* That is, the whole service was schismatic, because it was appointed by the Bishop. Their own service was Catholic, because appointed by themselves. What a misuse of terms! And the state of things on the following Sunday was no improvement. Now, here is a schism within a schism. Who shall compassionate revolvers when they reap the fruits of revolt; their own, as well as that of their forefathers, in which they glory while they suffer from it? *Quis tulerit Gracchos de seditione querentes?*

(2) In the second place, Ritualism, whatever its origin,

\* *Times* and *Standard*, February 19th 1877.

has become essentially a Protestant school of thought and action, maintained by private judgment, and protest against authority. "In the beginning of the movement," says Dr. Newman to his former friends, "you disowned private judgment ; but now, if you would remain a party, you must, with whatever inconsistency, profess it . . . You cannot be what you were. You will no longer be Anglo-Catholic, but Patristico-Protestants. You will be obliged to frame a religion for yourselves, and then to maintain that it is that very truth, pure and celestial, which the Apostles promulgated. You will be induced of necessity to put together some speculation of your own, and then to fancy it of importance enough to din it into the ears of your neighbours, to plague the world with it, and, if you have success, to convulse your own Communion with the imperious inculcation of doctrines which you can never engraft upon it." He continues : "What [the Catholic] would feel so prodigious is this : that such as you, my brethren, . . . should protest against private judgment, should profess to transmit what you have received, and yet from diligent study of the Fathers, from your thorough knowledge of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom, from living, as you say, in the atmosphere of Antiquity, that you should come forth into open day with your new edition of the Catholic faith, different from that held in any existing body of Christians anywhere, which not half-a-dozen men all over the world would honour with their *imprimatur* ; and then, withal, should be as positive about its truth in every part, as if the voice of mankind were with you instead of being against you. You are a body of yesterday ; you are a drop in the ocean of professing Christians ; yet you would give the law to priest and prophet . . . You have a mission to teach the National Church, which is to teach the British Empire, which is to teach the world : you are more learned than Greece ; you are purer than Rome ; you know more than St. Bernard ; you judge how far St. Thomas was right, and where he is to be read with caution, or held up to blame. Yes, and when you have done all, to what have you attained ? to do just what heretics have done before you, and, as doing, have incurred the anathema of Holy Church.

"Will it not be so, as I have said, . if you attempt at this time to perpetuate in the National Church a form of opinion which the National Church disowns? You do not follow its bishops; you disown its existing traditions; you are discontented with its divines; you shrink from its laity; you outstrip its Prayer-book. You have in all respects an eclectic or an original religion of your own. You dare not stand or fall by Andrewes, or by Laud, or by Hammond, or by Bull, or by Thorndike, or by all of them together. . Nearly all your divines, if not all, call themselves Protestants, and you anathematize the name. Who makes the concessions to Catholics which you do, yet remains separate from them? Who, among Anglican authorities, would speak of Penance as a Sacrament, as you do? Who of them encourages, much less insists upon, auricular confession, as you? or makes fasting an obligation? or uses the crucifix and the rosary? or reserves the consecrated bread? *or believes in miracles, as existing in your communion?*\* or administers, as I believe you do, extreme unction? In some points you prefer Rome, in others Greece, in others England, in others Scotland; and of that preference your own private judgment is the ultimate sanction." All this was said in 1850. Is the private judgment of the same body within the Establishment less developed, or less pronounced, in 1877?

(3) Finally: harsh as it must sound to say it, this party, which especially arrogates the claim of being apostolical, has come out, in its later manifestations, as not even episcopal. It is not more clear that the history of three centuries disproves its claims, nor that the formularies to which it is tied afford it no countenance, than it is clear that the bishops disown it, while it disowns the bishops in turn. Nay, of the three evident facts, this third appears to me the most patent, the most ceaseless in operation, and the most importunate in thrusting itself on public notice. It is therefore presbyterian; and herein it betrays a secret sympathy, congenital with the birth of the Establishment itself,

\* A recent persuasion among some of the ritualist school makes this question significant. Like the Jansenists and the Wesleyans, they have not been without their preternatural assurances of being in the right.

towards those so-called "reformed churches" which have cast off episcopal government altogether. It is too late now to furnish proofs of this; and yet startling passages might be given, not only from Bishop Hall and Whitgift, but from Davenant, Bull, Andrewes, Laud, and Taylor.\* Laud went to the block for prelacy; yet hear his ultimate convictions. "In Sweden, they retain both the thing and the name; and the governors of their churches are, and are called, bishops." [They have not the Apostolical succession; and therefore Laud here, in fact overthrows the necessity of that, anywhere; in England no less than in Sweden.] "And among the other Lutherans, the thing is retained, though not the name. For instead of Bishops, they are called Superintendents; and instead of Archbishops, General Superintendents. And yet even here, too, these names differ more in sound than in sense."†

Good news this, for our friends, if they intend to set up for themselves, and found a free Church of their own. They need be troubled with bishops no longer; and we shall be interested to hear of their General Superintendents. In the historic times of Charles Butler on the wrong side, and of Bishop Milner on the right, it was proposed that the small expiring remnant (as was thought) of Catholics in the land, without hope of succession, and only too grateful for permission to exist, should conciliate the government and their neighbours, by calling themselves, "Protesting Catholic Dissenters." The cap was thrown away, because nobody could be found to wear it. Honestly, I think the disciples of Ritualism might try it on. Even if it has to be slightly altered, they may come forth before the world as "Unepiscopal Apostolical Catholic-minded Non-juring Independents."

In asking pardon for detaining you so long, I feel that, while these lectures have been unreasonably prolix, on the other hand, they are quite insufficient for an adequate treatment of their subject. My aim has been to let others

\* See a curious tract, entitled "The agreement of the Lutheran churches with the Church of England," London, 1715. The motto is from Bull, who calls the Augsburg Confession "omnium nobilissima," and says that the first Anglican prelates followed or imitated it.

† *Laud's History of his Troubles*, p. 141. Digitized by Google



speak rather than myself; to furnish references instead of drawing out arguments; to suggest avenues of inquiry which may be profitably pursued. That the manner of doing this has been faulty, I am very conscious: but the three propositions I have maintained do not, happily, stand in need of more advocacy than I could bring to them. They may fairly be trusted to commend themselves to an average sense of truth, of honesty, and of past and present facts. May the result be to emancipate, were it but one soul, from its bondage to a specious but deadly error. If my great father and teacher, St. Ignatius, tells me that to prevent one mortal *sin*, when he can do no more, is gain enough for a man to labour for, during a life-time, what would be my consolation, if by the facts now stated, and the conclusions to which they would lead an earnest, thinking man, I could rescue, and guide to safety, one immortal *soul*?

## APPENDIX.

---

### A.

"EVEN when Anglicans approach in doctrine nearest to the Catholic Church, still heroism is not in the line of their excellence. . . If you wish to find the shadow and the suggestion of the supernatural qualities which make up the notion of a Catholic Saint, to Wesley you must go, and such as him. Personally, I do not like him, if it were merely for his deep self-reliance and self-conceit ; still I am bound, in justice to him, to ask, and you in consistency to answer, what historical personage in the Establishment, during its whole three centuries, has approximated in force and splendour of conduct and achievements to one who began by innovating on your rules, and ended by contemning your authorities? He and his companions, starting amid ridicule at Oxford, with fasting and praying, in the cold night air, then going about preaching, reviled by the rich and educated, and pelted and dragged to prison by the populace, and converting their thousands from sin to God's service—were it not for their pride and eccentricity and fanatical doctrine and untr tranquil devotion, they startle us, as if the times of St. Vincent Ferrer or St. Francis Xavier were come again in a Protestant land.

"Or, to turn to other communions, whom have you with the capabilities of greatness in them, which show themselves in the benevolent zeal of Howard the philanthropist, or Elizabeth Fry? Or consider the almost miraculous conversion and subsequent life of Colonel Gardiner. Why, even old Bunyan, with his vivid dreams when a child, his conversion, his conflicts with Satan, his preachings and imprisonments, however inferior to you in discipline of mind and knowledge of the truth, is, in the outline of his history, more Apostolic than you."\*

### B.

"Unto these (disorders) the change of altars into tables gave no small increase ; as well by reason of some differences which grew amongst the ministers themselves upon that occasion, as

\* Newman's *Anglican Difficulties*, lecture iii. pp. 76, 77.

in regard of that irreverence which it bred in the people, to whom it made the Sacrament to appear less venerable than before it did. The people had been so long accustomed to receive that Sacrament upon their knees, that no rule or canon was thought necessary to keep them to it; which thereupon was not imprudently omitted in the public rubrics. The change of altars into tables, the practice of the Church of strangers, and John a Lasco's book in maintenance of sitting at the Holy Table, made many think that posture best, which was so much countenanced. And what was likely to follow upon such a liberty, the proneness of those times to heterodoxies and profaneness gave just cause to fear. Somewhat was therefore to be done to prevent the mischief; and nothing could prevent it better, than to reduce the people to their ancient custom by some rule or rubric, by which they should be found [bound] to receive it kneeling. So [as?] for the ministers themselves, they seemed to be as much at a loss in their officiating at the table, as the people were in their irreverence to the Blessed Sacrament: which cannot better be expressed than in the words of of some Popish prelates, by whom it was objected unto some of our chief Reformers. Thus, White, of Lincoln, chargeth it upon Bishop Ridley. . . . 'That, when their table was constituted, they could never be content in placing the same; now East, now North; now one way, now another: until it pleased God of His goodness to place it quite out of the Church.' The like did Weston, the Prolocutor of the Convocation in the first of Queen Mary, in a disputation held with Latimer; telling him, with contempt and reproach enough, that the Protestants having turned their tables, were like a company of apes, that knew not which way to turn their tails; looking one day East, and another day West; one this way, and another that way, as their fancies led them. Thus, finally, one Miles Hubbard, in a book called 'The Display of Protestants,'\* doth report the business: 'How long,' say they, 'were they learning to set their tables to minister the Communion upon? First, they placed it aloft, where the High Altar stood; then must it be removed from the wall, that one might go between; the ministers being in contention whether part to turn their faces, either towards the West, the North, or South; some would stand westward, some northward, some southward.' 'It was not to be thought but that the Papists would much please themselves in these disorders; and that this difference and diversity, though in circumstances only, might draw contempt upon the Sacrament itself, and give great scandal unto many moderate and well-meaning men.'†

\* Printed 1551, p. 81. † Heylin, p. 106, the 5th year of Ed. VI. 1551.

## C.

Heylin, in winding up his Church History (p. 346, ed. 1674), at the eighth year of Elizabeth, complains that the Puritan faction had begun to disturb the Church's order; and, that the account of this may be "with the greater certainty, I shall speak it," he says, "in the words of one who lived, and writ his knowledge of it, at this time: I mean John Rastel, in his answer to the Bishop's (Jewel's) challenge: who, though he were a Papist, and a fugitive priest, yet I conceive that he hath faithfully delivered too many sad truths in these particulars. Three books he writ, within the compass of three years now last past, against Bishop Jewell, in one of which he makes this address unto him; viz., 'And though you, Mr. Jewell (as I have heard say) do take the Bread into your hands, when you celebrate solemnly; yet thousands there are of your inferior ministers, whose death it is to be bound to any such external fashion; and your order of celebrating the Communion is so unadvisedly conceived, that every man is left unto his private rule or Canon, whether he will take the Bread into his hands, or let it stand at the end of the table, the Bread and Wine being laid upon the table, where it pleases the sexton or parish clerk to set them' (p. 28).

"In the Primitive Church, Altars were allowed amongst Christians, upon which they offered the unbloody Sacrifice of Christ's Body; yet your company, to declare what followers they are of antiquity, do account it even among one of the kinds of Idolatry, if one keep an Altar standing. And, indeed, you follow a certain antiquity, not of the Catholics, but of desperate heretics: Optatus, writing of the Donatists, that they did break, rase, and remove the Altars of God, upon which they offered" (pp. 34 and 165).

Rastel is the unchallenged witness of other abuses rife in his day, regarding the administration of Communion. If his statements had not been "sad truths," they certainly would not have passed unchallenged by Jewel, or by Heylin after him.

"Where did you ever read," he says; *i.e.*, read in the Antiquity which you profess to follow; "that the Communion Table (if any then were) was removable up and down, hither and thither, and brought at any time to the lower parts of the Church, there to execute the Lord's Supper?" "Or that the residue of the Sacrament unreceived, was taken of [by] the Priest, or of the Parish Clerk to spread their young children's butter thereupon, or to serve at their homely [domestic] table, or that the lay people communicating did take the cup at one another's hands, and not at the Priest's?"

These are the "sad truths" which Heylin is compelled to

receive at the hands of "a Papist, and a fugitive priest," contemporary with the facts he was recording. And then, in the face of these facts, marvellous to say, Heylin, as an unpromising apologist of the Church of England, breaks out magniloquently, and so concludes his book :—

"Thus have we seen the Church established on a sure foundation, the doctrine built upon the Prophets and Apostles, according to the explication of the ancient Fathers; the government truly Apostolical, and (in all essential parts thereof) of divine institution; the liturgy an extract of the primitive forms," and so forth.

Is it not wonderful, that Heylin should first give us these tremendous charges, or appeals to fact, from a Catholic priest, and then go on, in the next breath, to assert all the fine things he says of his Anglican Communion? "Sad truths," says Heylin, if I may paraphrase him, "does Rastel tell us: for he says that in his day the Anglicans showed such irreverence and carelessness in administering their communion, that thousands of them never took the Bread into their hands at the consecration; that they rejoiced, like the Donatists, in pulling down the altars; that their Communion tables were moved about at will; that they took home 'the residue of the Sacrament' to eat it with their families:—and thus we see the glories, the consent to antiquity, the truly Apostolical character, the sure foundation of the Church of England."

#### D.

"These things are beyond us. Nature can do so much, and go so far, can form such rational notions of God and of duty, without grace or merit, or a future hope; good sense has such an instinctive apprehension of what is fitting; intellect, imagination, and feeling can so take up, develope, and illuminate what Nature has originated; education and the communication of ideas can so insinuate into the mind what really does not belong to it; grace, not effectual, but inchoate, can so plead, and its pleadings look so like its fruits; and its mere visitations may so easily be mistaken for its indwelling presence; and its vestiges, when it has departed, may gleam so beautifully on the dead soul, that it is quite impossible for us to conclude, with any fairness of argument, that a certain opinion is true, or a religious position safe, on account of the confidence or apparent excellence of those who adopt it. Of course we think as tenderly of them as we can; and may fairly hope that what we see is, in some instances, the work of Grace, wrought on those who are in invincible ignorance; but the claim is unreasonable and exorbitant, if they expect their state of mind to

be taken in evidence, not only of promise in the individual, but of truth in his creed.

"And, should this view of the subject unsettle and depress you, as if it left you no means at all of ascertaining whether God loves you, or whether anything is true, or anything to be trusted, then let this feeling answer the purpose for which I have impressed it on you. I wish to deprive you of your undue confidence in self: I wish to dislodge you from that centre in which you sit so self-possessed and self-satisfied. Your fault has been, to be satisfied with but a half evidence of your security; you have been too well contented with remaining where you found yourselves, not to catch at a line of argument, so indulgent, yet so plausible. You have thought that position impregnable; and growing confident, as time went on, you have presumed to pronounce it blasphemy against the Holy Ghost to doubt of your Church and of its ordinances. Learn, my dear brethren, a more sober, a more cautious tone of thought. Learn to fear for your souls. It is something indeed to be peaceful within, but it is not everything. It may be the stillness of death. The Catholic, and he alone, has within him that union of external with internal notes of God's favour, which makes him both fearless in his faith, and calm and thankful in his hope."\*

#### E.

#### *His Majesty's Declaration.*

"Being by God's ordinance, according to our just Title, Defender of the Faith, and Supreme Governor of the Church within these our Dominions, we hold it most agreeable to this our kingly office, and our own religious zeal, to conserve and maintain the Church committed to our charge, in the unity of true religion, and in the bond of peace; and not to suffer unnecessary disputations, altercations, or questions to be raised, which may nourish faction both in the Church and Commonwealth. We have, therefore, upon mature deliberation, and with the advice of so many of our Bishops as might conveniently be called together, thought fit to make this Declaration following:

"That the Articles of the Church of England . . . do contain the true doctrine of the Church of England, agreeable to God's Word; which we do therefore ratify and confirm, requiring all our loving subjects to continue in the uniform profession thereof, and prohibiting the least difference from the said Articles; which to that end we command to be new printed, and this our Declaration to be published therewith.

"That we are Supreme Governor of the Church of England:

\* Newman's *Anglican Difficulties*, lecture iii, s.f.

and that if any difference arise about the external policy, concerning the injunctions, canons, and other constitutions whatsoever thereto belonging, the clergy in their Convocation are to order and settle them, *having first obtained leave under our Broad Seal* so to do, and we approving their said ordinances and constitutions ; provided that none be made contrary to the laws and customs of the land.

"That out of our princely care, that the Churchmen may do the work which is proper unto them, the bishops and clergy in convocation, upon their humble desire, shall have licence under our Broad Seal to deliberate of, and to do all such things, as being made plain, and assented unto by us, shall concern the settled continuance of the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England now established : from which we will not endure any varying or departing in the least degree."

Was ever servitude more complete ?

#### F.

"The Dean's [of Manchester] resolution was that, inasmuch as all priests having cure of souls in any diocese have received their commission from the bishop as chief pastor, it is an invasion of the rights of the Church that any priest should be inhibited *a sacris* by other than spiritual authority. He contended that as all beneficed priests were the curates of bishops, and *derived their mission as well as ordination* from bishops, so it was only reasonable that the clergy should be inhibited or deprived by the same authority. . . . It is plain that, if carried out, the proposal would go to the whole length of *annulling the Reformation settlement*, and repealing the Statute of 1534, by which *the clergy bound themselves to acknowledge the Supremacy of a civil tribunal*. This tribunal was the Court of Delegates, representing "the King in Chancery ;" and though changes have taken place during the last three centuries, somewhat altering the basis on which this agreement was concluded, the Dean of Manchester's resolution is manifestly directed, not to the restoration of that basis, but to the repudiation of the agreement itself. The rejection of the civil supremacy means the severance of the Church from the State, and *if our Ritualistic enthusiasts acted fairly, they would openly acknowledge this truth*. But they shut their eyes to it, and lead others to shut their eyes to it as much as they possibly can ; and it may be that they feel, in their inmost hearts, the impossibility of carrying any large number of Englishmen with them, if they once plainly discerned the goal toward which they were advancing."

"When his Grace [the Archbishop of York, presiding over the Northern Convocation,] asked if it was worth while to provoke such a perilous convulsion for the colour of a vestment,

or the posture of a clergyman, we fear he was only irritating those whom it was his special object to conciliate. In the eyes of the advanced Ritualist, ritual is all in all. Vestments and postures are as essential as creeds and catechisms. To endure disestablishment for the sake of a stole or chasuble is, from their point of view, an act of high and holy martyrdom. It is in vain to inquire of them what the Church of England was in those benighted days when vestments and postures were alike unknown? If these things are essential to the Catholicity of the Church of England, where was her Catholicity in the eighteenth century? *Once lost, it could never be regained except by re-opening communications with the fountain head.\**

## G.

"During the periods of the most active Church legislation, whether in former or present times, these pretensions [regarding the powers of Convocation] were very rarely put forth, hardly ever acknowledged. Of the four revisions of the Divine Service of the Church of England—twice in the reign of Edward VI., once in the reign of Elizabeth, once in the reign of Charles II.—it was only on the last occasion that the assent of Convocation was recorded in the Act of Parliament by which the changes became law; and even on that occasion Parliament asserted its right to make the changes by its own authority. The same absence of any synodical sanction is equally conspicuous in the numerous acts which, from the Reformation downwards, have dealt with the spiritual interests of the Church. The marriage of the clergy, the abolition of chantries, the abolition of images, the enactment of subscription under Queen Elizabeth, the relaxation of it under Queen Victoria, the enactment of the Test Act under Charles II., the abolition of it under William IV., the Toleration Act, the Roman Catholic Relief Act, the Act establishing the Ecclesiastical Commission, the Pluralities and Residence Acts, the Acts for Suppressing Irish Bishoprics or creating English Bishoprics, the abolition of the Services drawn up by Convocation for the 31st of January, the 29th of May, and the 5th of November—have all been carried without deference, sometimes in opposition, to the known or the possible opinions of the Southern or Northern Convocation." †

\* *Standard*, April 20, 1877.

† "An English Churchman" in the *Times* of April 17, 1877.





IS THERE UNITY  
IN  
"THE CHURCH OF ROME?"

*LETTERS TO A FRIEND*

BY

W. H. ANDERDON,

*Priest of the Society of Jesus.*

---

THIRD EDITION.

---

LONDON :  
BURNS AND OATES, PORTMAN STREET  
AND PATERNOSTER ROW.

---

1878.

Digitized by Google

THE following letters contained kindly personal expressions, here omitted, as irrelevant for those to whose consideration these pages are offered. In this third edition, moreover, some verbal alterations have been made, chiefly on the side of a gentler expression; and a few additions, for greater clearness and completeness of statement.

## *Is there Unity in "the Church of Rome?"*

---

### I.

A friend of mine, an excellent, conscientious man, a man of moral as well as social position, committed the error, this autumn,\* of coming forward on a public platform, and making the following assertion :

"Sometimes they [himself and his co-religionists] were told that the Church was going to pieces on account of internal differences ; but the differences which existed in the English Church were nothing when compared with those which agitated the Church of Rome."

### II.

On which, he received this letter :

The \* \* reports you as having said, at Z., something to the effect, that "the divisions of the Church of England were as nothing to those of the Church of Rome."

I know well, by experience, what a hash the papers do sometimes make of one's utterances, and therefore entertain the hope that you were unfairly reported. Neither have I, of course, any claim except that of affection, to ask you whether it was so or not. As the words stand, they look like an extensive and public false witness against one's neighbour ; but I am sure you are too careful about the Decalogue to have any such conscious intention, and that, if you did use them, it was from being hurried away, *inter concionandum*, to say what your own calmer judgment would have felt to be without foundation.

As to the divisions in the Church of England, the same paper, and subsequent issues of it, contain quite enough. I

\* The first edition was dated, Advent, 1875.

will not pain you by doing more than point out that they are far from being non-essential. They go down to the foundations of doctrine, and of doctrines the most vital. If I were to draw out a catena of propositions which, to my knowledge, clergymen and teachers in your communion hold and teach (and hold, more than they venture to teach),\* it would be sufficiently appalling.

What, then, are the divisions among ourselves, to which these are as nothing? Accept my experience, as having been a member of my communion for a quarter of a century. I gravely assure you, that I should be at a loss to name a division among us, except on such points as, *e.g.*, Gothic versus Italian architecture and vestments, or plain chant versus figured music. These are points which touch neither faith nor morals, and if the Holy See should think fit to pronounce, you would see this "division" annihilated. *Roma locuta est, causa finita est*; now, as in the days of St. Augustine.

I would add the belief in Anglican Orders, but that is entertained by a few crotchety people, of whom personally I could only name one.† Poor Q. R., who died mad, was, I believe, another. And here again, *Roma non est locuta*, though her practice is as emphatic as any utterance: declaring, on one hand, the iteration of the Sacrament of Order to be sacrilege, and on the other hand, ordaining categorically all those who come over to her. If the Archbishop of Canterbury had the grace of conversion, he would first be baptized conditionally, and then, if he wished to be a priest, tonsured and ordained without any condition.

I have exhausted the list of our "divisions," as far as I know it. I have heard of Catholics (in name) who have allowed themselves to speak against both the Immaculate Conception and the Pope's Infallibility, after the several definitions. But they are so little Catholics, that if they

\* This was not meant as a general assertion, which would have been a very culpable exaggeration. But, besides the various "economies," in differing degrees, to which men are reduced who are out of harmony with their bishops, it is unhappily too true that the divergences which appear above the surface only indicate others, not always expressed.

† Add, an eccentric Scotsman, whom I heard of in Rome, twenty-five years ago; and perhaps another, who may or may not retain his union.

came to me to confession, I should be unable to absolve them, until they assured me of their unhesitating acceptance of these doctrines as a matter of divine faith, professed their sincere contrition for their sin, and promised to repair the scandal as publicly as they had given it. That is, until they had become Catholics again.

And now I think I may ask you, whether you were right in making so sweeping and so public an assertion, on absolutely no ground? There is a text, St. Matt. xii. 36, 37, on which I will not enlarge, because it speaks for itself. Do think over it and pray over it a little. When I hear, as I do every day, the most outrageous and slanderous things said against the Church, I am moved certainly to sorrow for those who commit themselves to the responsibility of saying them, but, for ourselves, I cannot but rejoice that we inherit so distinctly the Beatitude. We have "all manner of things said against us falsely, for His sake." But you are worth more than to find yourself in the common category of slanderers; and I felt a tightening about my heart when I read your words.

I am not wishing to draw you into a discussion. I am too old for that, and have not time for it, nor you either; moreover, by sad experience, I know how futile it is to place even the clearest evidences of religion before those who are not prepared to receive them. We should probably have lived and died without my troubling you on the subject. But when a man steps on a platform and utters, on a very grave subject-matter, what is distinctly mistaken, and (let me add) pernicious; and when, moreover, one is convinced of his thoroughly honest intentions, and that his error, and—let me speak plainly—his sin, is one of inconsideration or of surprise, then it would be disloyalty to the truth, and show a want of regard for the speaker, to remain silent.

That you may one day, if God wills to be so merciful to you, know by happy experience what is the essential Unity, and what the repose and joy of the soul, in the only true home of Faith, is the wish for you, &c.

Is it not curious that the Bishop of Lincoln, only a few days after you, asserted our Unity, while he proclaimed it a unity of darkness, of error, and—other civil expressions?

## III.

So far, there was no intention of beginning a correspondence, or putting anything into print. It was an ordinary and kindly letter to a personal friend. I wished to point out to him his mistake, for his own good and that of other members of his family, in whose welfare I am deeply interested. His answer was disappointing. He answered, that he believed at the time of speaking, and still believed, the correctness of what he stated; adding some amiable aspirations for the coming of the time when doubts and differences would cease to exist.

## IV.

The second letter addressed to him ran thus :

You say that you still believe the correctness of what you stated. You will not therefore think that I press you unduly when I ask for any one instance of differences amongst us, to which your own "are as nothing." A straightforward man is ready to substantiate what he has asserted, especially on a public occasion.

As a standard of comparison, let me ask you, are not the differences in your communion vital? Take confession and absolution. I have no papers by me; but you know how easily a catena might be given, which would show A. asserting the almost necessity of that distinctive doctrine and consequent practice, while B. denounces it as priestcraft, and C. would leave it an open question—whereas it must be either good or evil in a high degree. Nor are these obscure theorists. Your bishops are exponents of the two latter opinions; Pusey, and other leaders, would be for the first. Take the infidelity of the *Essays and Reviews*. How many of their authors and sympathisers are ministering at your communion tables, and teaching in your pulpits?

Now, such "differences," you say, "are as nothing to the Church of Rome." I will not ask for half

a dozen, but will be content with two or three. What are they, in the name of justice and honesty? You will not quote words from Bonn, or from Berne; for these men, as you know, are not Catholics. I might as well quote a Wesleyan as an expositor of your communion, or a Russo-Greek for ours. "They went out from us, but were not of us." Show me a man, receiving the Sacraments at the hands of a Catholic priest, who differs from any other man receiving them, in any matter of faith; show me this, to sustain the comparison you make. I shall say, either that man is deceiving the priest, and is both schismatic in heart and sacrilegious, or that priest is betraying his trust, and would be suspended, if known, by his Bishop.\*

Let me add, that you are bound in candour, and in honour, not to pass my question by. You will not, I am sure, be like O., who brought a public accusation he could not support, and then shuffled miserably. You have made a mistake, and a grave one; but we are all liable to mistakes. St. Augustine was never nobler than in his Retractions. We ought, indeed, to think twice before we charge others in a serious matter, and thrice before we do it in public. A City man would be brought to account at once, who would say: "My neighbour, X. Y., professes to be a man of capital, whereas he is on the verge of fraudulent bankruptcy." Why, then, may he say: "The Church of two hundred millions of men professes to be united, whereas its divisions are incomparably greater than ours?" Having said it, he will lose no time in substantiating the statement, or repairing the error. And that, under pain of offending against a commandment which we both acknowledge as Divine: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour."

## V.

To this he answered at greater length, that he had not spoken of *divisions* in the Church of Rome, but of *differences*

\* It is almost unnecessary to add, that the second case is purely hypothetical.



*agitating* it. He candidly admitted, that as the time allowed for his speech was limited, he was compelled to use expressions without modification, and so might have given them greater force than he wished, or than was necessary for his argument. He added other handsome expressions, fully bearing out the ethical character I have given him; and then went on to adduce authorities for his assertion.

The claim of his correspondent he took to be, for the Church of Rome, an absolute calm and unity.

This seem to him to be opposed by

1. The history of Jansenism, as given in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, where it is stated that Alexander VII. (October, 1656) sent into France a formula embodying the substance of his Bull, which "the whole body of the French clergy, except four bishops, refused." The conclusion was that, though "the difference was after a fashion composed in 1713, by a Bull of Clement XI.," yet, as "the contest had raged during a great part of the seventeenth century," differences had then agitated the Church of Rome.

2. "A little work," entitled *Why I left the Church of Rome*, in which the author speaks of the effect produced on his mind by the definition of the Immaculate Conception, after the "long struggle" between the Dominicans and the Franciscans; and goes on to discredit the unity of the Church, on the ground of the contentions between Thomists and Scotists, Jesuits and Dominicans, Ultramontane and Cisalpine parties. The author of the little work concludes by asking, "Are we to say that these are so many branches of the Roman Church?"

3. *The Pope and the Council*, by Janus, especially the Preface by the Anglican translator, who speaks of the party to which the German author belongs, as morally if not numerically strong\* within the Church's pale; "yielding to

\* On this point, an extract from Dr. Hergenröther's work, mentioned below, p. 18, note, will be read with interest: "Is this small sect, which is almost wholly confined to one country, and which even there numbers comparatively few followers, is this indeed the Church Catholic, which, according to the judgment of the Fathers, is known by this very mark—that she is spread over the face of the earth, that she exists where sects also exist, while they are not to be found in many places where she is? . . . Döllinger indeed wrote [Declaration of March 28, 1871] 'Thousands amongst the clergy, hundreds of

none in loyal devotion to Catholic truth, but unable to identify its interests with Ultramontanism."

4. *Evenings with the Romanists*, By the Rev. M. H. Seymour, pp. 36—61.

5. A telegram taken from a newspaper of November 5, 1875, which mentions that the Bavarian Bishops had addressed their King "respecting the position of the 'Old Catholics' in connection with the maintenance of schools and convents." My friend here asks: "Is this a message of peace and of concord, or of difference and of agitation? It has a strange look."

6. Another telegram in the same paper informs him of the disposition of the Italian Government, in consequence of Signor Minghetti's speech, "to introduce the laity's intervention to protect the lower clergy from episcopal tyranny;" which my friend holds to be a state of things inconsistent with absolute unity, and with the absence of differences that cause agitation.

So much of this letter is here given as may interpret the following reply.

## VI.

I was heartily glad to receive your letter yesterday. It has restored that personal confidence in you, which, I confess, had been somewhat shaken by (1) your public statement, (2) your silence.\* The statement itself was such that, knowing the Unity of the Church never to have been broken, and our Lord's prayer for it never to have failed,

thousands amongst the laity, think as I do, and hold it impossible to accept the new article of faith; but his pretended knowledge of men's hearts has come to shame. A few professors, puffed up with learning; a few priests, many of whom were not leading priestly lives before then; some men of culture, so called, who, for the most part, had never been rightly instructed in the faith, or who had long ago thrown it overboard; such, chiefly, are the new heretics who have nominally been at such pains to guard the purity of the faith. Pastors without flocks, liberal magistrates, Catholics who had long been non-practising, now form the stronghold of 'Old Catholicism': and this little group presumes to call itself the true Old Catholic Church, and to style the immense majority of Catholics, the Pope, and the united Episcopate, traitors!"—*Catholic Church and Christian State*, vol. i. pp. 128, 129.

\* I omit, as irrelevant, a short note written to my friend, urging him to reply, as he afterwards did in No. V.

I was at a loss to reconcile your speech with that candour I had always believed to be in you.

We are, indeed, on our side, quite accustomed to untrue charges and statements: we have learnt to regard them as symptoms of the preternatural aversion of Englishmen, at large, to the Catholic faith. A man, fair and candid towards others, seems incapable of being so towards ourselves. We never expect any retraction from the generality. On the principle, that if you throw a good deal of mud, some will stick, they discharge their handful or bucketful, and pass on to the next employment with a serene countenance, and (I suppose) conscience. Almost as I write, P. Q.,\* having committed himself at a public meeting to unhistorical statements about the Nicene Council, has been fully answered by a priest in the place. Do I expect to see retraction or acknowledgment from P. Q.? I should regard it as a high-class miracle. Who, of all those who applauded his mis-statement, would care to see a refutation?

A man convinced against his will  
Is of the same opinion still.

This conviction has more than once tempted me to throw together some salient examples, which might be headed, "Protestant candour." I was sorry, indeed, to think I should have to class *you* under that category. "Who would not weep, if Atticus were he?"

Let me briefly examine your points of justification.

First, what is the question between us? A comparison between the alleged "differences" or "divisions" existing within the two communions, in quality, of course, as in quantity. You lay stress on my inadvertently using one of the terms I have marked by commas, instead of the other; but I think this an over-subtle distinction. A difference which agitates, and continues to do so, is surely a "division," as a morbid humour that is not expelled from the frame, becomes an organic disease. If you had meant only: "There have been, in every century, questions emerging in the Church, from Arius to Döllinger, which have agitated men's minds, exercised theologians, promoted discussion, necessitated appeal to the Holy See; and this, until *Roma*

\* An Anglican bishop.

*locuta est*, and then, *causa finita est*." all this is so true, and so characteristic of the Church, as a living body made up of active minds, that I should not have thought twice about your saying it, in public or private. The question then, is, *not*

Have differences agitated the Church of Rome? but,

Do differences, or divisions, on faith, so as to be analogous to yours, exist within the Church of Rome?

The former question of the two is resolved by St. Paul, and by St. John,\* nor need we waste words about it. The supreme authority of the Holy See was established by our Divine Lord,† for the very purpose of *confirming* the weak and wavering in the faith, declaring, defining it, and expelling the false teacher with his disciples. What else is the history of General Councils, and definitions of doctrine against emergent errors?

The second question remains, and here we join issue. I say again, there is unity within what I do not mind calling "the Church of Rome," inasmuch as a centre implies the circumference.‡ Unity on every point of faith, morals, discipline. If differences arise, of sufficient importance, there is the immediate appeal to the Holy See, and all is at rest.

I have no wish to exaggerate your own differences or divisions. The more united your communion, the more effectually might it stem the flood of infidelity that threatens it; the less facility should we find in converting "men of good will" and candour from its ranks, to the Unity of the One true Church. I have small hope of any unity among you to resist infidelity; and I have no fear of any such unity to withstand or retard the work of conversion to the Faith. People come to our unity every day, convinced by your disunions.

Now, as to the proofs you allege.

1. You go back to Jansenism; to which I willingly follow, because, though I only asserted the Church's present

\* 1 Cor. xi. 18, 19; 1 St. John ii. 18, 19.

† St. Luke xxii. 31, 32; St. Matt. xvi. 17—19.

‡ It might have been added: And the circumference implies the centre. There can be no Catholic or universal Church without a Catholic or universal head.

unity, yet the principle extends throughout its life. Your Encyclopædia strangely asserts the very contrary of what I read in the only book I have at hand, Moreri's *Dictionnaire Historique*, Article, "Jansenius." This writer, a French priest, published his work in Paris, 1725, a very Gallican period; and is as safe from "Ultramontanism" as could be desired. Yet, instead of "the whole body of the French clergy, except four bishops," disobeying the Bull of Alexander VII., his statement is:

"Le Pape Alexandre VII. par sa Bulle du 16 Octobre de la même année (1656), declara que les cinque propositions étoient tirées de Jansenius, et qu'elles avoient été condamnées dans le sens de cet auteur. Les assemblées du clergé de 1660, de 1661, et 1664, ordonnerent la signature du formulaire; qui fut autorisée par une declaration du roi du 29 avril. En consequence on le fit signer dans tous les diocèses de France, aux ecclesiastiques, etc. . . . On voulut même faire le procès a quatre évêques de France, qui avoient, dans leurs mandemens publics, distingué le fait du droit, et déclaré qu'ils ne demandoient qu'une soumission de silence respectueux pour le fait."

So here we have an obedient instead of a rebellious clergy, "the whole body of the French clergy" of your Encyclopædia; and we have four refractory instead of four obedient bishops. Your author must somehow have read his history backwards. So easy is it to round things off in flowing periods, especially when a writer is anonymous, and cannot be brought to book.

I am not up in the history of Jansenism; but it certainly was not so wide a severance from the Church as Lutheranism, and far less than the Nestorian heresy, which tore away so large a portion of the East.

This agitation in the Church, like all others before and since, brought into sharp relief the antagonistic principles of rebellion and obedience. So, the Divine command issued to the angels divided them at once into the faithful and the fallen. "There was war in heaven," says the Apocalypse. Is that an argument against the unity of heaven? The war secured the perpetual unity of the celestial hosts who kept their first estate. There was war in the camp of Israel, when Core and his followers rose up against

Moses and Aaron with a cry analogous to the "No Popery" of modern times. The Unity of the Church of the Old Testament was established on the destruction of "those sinners against their own souls." So in the Catholic Church, whether we regard the heresies condemned in the early Councils, or in that of Trent, or of the Vatican. "There must be also heresies," says St. Paul, and that, for the trial of the elect. Heresy springs up in the Church, but it is cast out of the Church. It is cast out by the Holy See; Peter "confirming his brethren."\* With you, there is no power of casting out: the disease rankles and festers, because, three hundred years ago, England disowned St. Peter, and so cut off the final appeal. The Queen in Council is a poor substitute; and her tribunal adjudicates, on doctrines of faith, by half a dozen lawyers. This is the *πρωτον ψευδος* of the so-called Reformation. No Popery means, No Certainty—No teaching authority. All is conflicting interpretation: by evangelicals, of the Bible; by Döllinger, of history; by Pusey, of Fathers; by Sir R. Phillimore, of formularies. Gorham was pronounced sufficiently orthodox to be inducted; and "an honest moveable table," though with an antependium, sufficiently unlike an altar to be tolerated. Candlesticks may be on the table, if unlighted; and a cross in the middle, except when the bishop is coming. "Wo to the foolish prophets, that follow their own spirit, and see nothing."

2. You quote an apostate priest about the Immaculate Conception, the Thomists and Scotists, Jesuits and Dominicans. There were long struggles on the questions involved in these terms. But in my first letter I asked you to remark that the whole question between us was on differences of *faith*. I must here bring you back to the text. "The differences which exist in the Established Church are nothing when compared to those which agitate the Church of Rome." That is, of course, either ours are more numerous, or are more important, than yours.

Let us then compare.

(A) *As to our differences.*

Between the men who disputed, with sufficient vigour, sometimes with unbecoming virulence, on either side of

\* St. Luke, *ut supra*, digitized by Google

the controversies named, *there was no difference on faith*. They were questions that wholesomely agitated\* the minds of theologians, and were carried on under the Church's express supervision. You might as well say that an ordeal of combat, carried on under the eyes of a mediæval sovereign, threatened the disruption of his kingdom. The universities were the open theatres of these dialectic contests. The Pope of the day presided in person at the controversy on Grace. Each disputant said his Mass every morning, with the same faith as his opponent. For each iota already defined, and for the Church's power of defining, the disputants on either side would each have laid down his life. Thomist or Scotist would have been torn by wild horses, rather than dispute any one canon of any one Council. Jesuit and Dominican were martyred side by side at Tyburn for their common faith; strung up to the same beam, cut down and disembowelled by the same knife. Is it not worse than misconception, in the writers and orators to whom you commit yourself, to tell you we are disunited?

We owe to such disputations as your writer refers to, some of our most brilliant treatises on undefined doctrine, tending to its elucidation, and to its definition. And when once, perhaps after centuries, and "agitations" as much as you will, which disturbed the faith of nobody, any more than the set disputations in our theological schools disturb our faith to-day—when once the moment came, and the definition was opportune, then—I will quote St. Augustine again—*Roma locuta est, causa finita est*. Where is the Scotist, or where the Dominican, who ever re-opened it, unless he also apostatised, like the author of the *Reasons*?

This unhappy man well knew, it is to be feared, a distinction which must have possessed his mind from his first studies in theology; that, I mean, between points of faith and open theological questions. But he throws dust in your eyes, who do not so readily perceive a distinction, which a theologian would know to be essential.

\* *Exercised* would have been a better word, inasmuch as agitation seems to imply anxiety, as though the faith were in danger. This never can be, so long as Cephas, the final appeal, confirms his brethren.

## VII.

I resume, in order to conclude. My object is to show that, if you had reversed your statement, and said that the differences in "the Church of Rome" were as nothing to those which agitate "the English Church," you would have said the accurate truth. Though I have put this informally, the following propositions will contain much of my meaning :

1. There are no differences among us on the points on which the Pope speaks *ex cathedra*.

2. The differences among us are, for the most part, slight indeed : pointed or square chasubles, and trifles of a similar kind, on which only a weak-minded man would lay any stress.\* Plain chant *versus* figured music is one degree more important. I added the question of Anglican orders, in order to be accurate and exhaustive : though, as I said, I hardly knew of more than one man who believed them, and he was insane.

3. There have been differences of great importance arising among us through eighteen hundred years, "from Arius to Döllinger;" and they have been settled, from the Nicene to the Vatican Council, by the same authority, speaking with the same infallibility : "It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us."

On the other hand,

4. Vital differences exist among you, on points of *faith* : and to this I now briefly address myself, rather by reference to authorities than with any leisure to develope them.

(B.) *As to your differences.*

I will instance some that have always been ; and some that have more recently emerged.

(1.) Is the Second Person of the Adorable Trinity truly and corporeally present on your communion tables, Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity ; or only in such a "spiritual" sense as excludes what the last rubric in your Communion Service calls the presence of His "natural" Body ? Is He present on the table as He is in heaven, with the only difference of visibility, and kindred qualities ? Is He so

\* Apart, of course, from any possible expression of the Church's mind on such lesser points.



present as to be truly adorable on the one, as in the other? Is not this a most vital question of faith? Could you state any question affecting the Incarnation that shall be more vital? Now, I leave it to your candour to say, whether on this point your church is or is not "a house divided against itself." Is the belief of Archdeacon Denison that of his bishop? or of Mr. Mackonochie that of his? Your clergy sign the Article that pledges them against Transubstantiation; and Transubstantiation is the only definition that really meets the subtleties of heresy. For heresy can drive a wedge through "traselementation," "transmutation," and the other expressions current before the definition of Trent. But, short of the Tridentine term, there is among you a graduated scale of opinion, from Zuinglianism to Consubstantiation. Twenty-five years ago, and more, when at my communion table I turned to my people with the bread in my hand, I could not avoid the thought striking me, as with a blow: "Among all those who are kneeling at that rail, there are as many opinions as individuals, as to what they are going to receive."

Show me a difference among us, to which this is "as nothing."

I refer you to *Cardwell's Documentary Illustrations of the Reformed Church of England*, in proof that this difference was congenital with its life, and grew with its growth. I should like to have time to draw out his proof. As the title implies, it is strictly documentary and from the Anglican point of view.

What is the history of that "black rubric," as it has been well named, at the end of your Communion Service? When was it put in, taken out, put in again? Under what contending influences did men play fast and loose with the most august and awful of questions? And is this no "difference to agitate," down to its inmost depths, a religious mind?

Take the words with which the elements are given to the communicant: the first clause Catholic, the second Sacramentarian; the union of the two, as it now stands, an after-thought of compromise, most typical of the Church of England. If this difference has not *agitated*, it has only been because those who framed your formularies had the wisdom—of this world—to say, of Eucharistic truth: "Let it be neither thine nor mine, but *divide it*."

Cardwell shows you (and I hardly know anything more painfully interesting) how, by one royal and episcopal edict after another, the Mass melted into the Communion, the altar into the table, the priest into the minister. It was a series of dissolving views, and the nation was simply juggled out of its religion; you and I included, in the persons of our forefathers.

(2.) Take, again, priestly absolution, which is either a blessing or a blasphemy. Is it not obvious how vital is the alternative?

If these questions agitate your co-religionists less, as time wears on, it is because "truths are diminished from among the children of men." \* Things are tolerated now, which would have been intolerable in my day. Your bishops see that a safety-valve is necessary, and are prepared to make it as wide, almost, as you like, provided only you will not return to the religion of St. Austin and St. Anselm. Everything is tolerated, except only the truth. All may be relaxed, except the one deadly opposition to it. And this is called a growth of Catholicity. As St. Leo said of pagan Rome; *Magnam sibi videbatur assumpsisse religionem, quia nullam respuebat falsitatem.* †

(3.) The eternity of punishment, and the inspiration of Scripture, you will admit to be vital questions. Yet in our own time, an able man, preacher to one of the Inns of Court, lived and died denying the first; and the authors of *Essays and Reviews* have never been stripped of their gowns: one of them, indeed, has had lawn sleeves put over his. These are glass windows, from which it is better not to throw stones. Any priest among us who should—I will not say deny, but—cast a shade of doubt over these fundamental doctrines, or any of equal importance, would be before his Bishop, ere the week was out. If he failed to make public recantation and reparation, he would be suspended, and refused all Sacraments. He could not be absolved: he could not communicate among the laity, not to speak of saying Mass.

Can you still maintain your assertion?

\* Psalm xi. 1.

† *Serm. 1 in Nativ. SS. Pet. et Pauli.* Google

3. I come now to your third source of information : \* "The Pope and the Council." This is by the notorious "Janus." But have you ever read "Anti-Janus?" Did you ever know of its existence? Does it answer the book? If not, where not? Do the Cardinal's Pastorals, on his return from Rome, throw any light on the "freedom of the Council," &c., &c. I refer you to his *Privilegium Petri*. Again, could I give "Janus" the Sacraments? Without recantation, no more than to his pagan prototype with two faces. The translator calls the author a Catholic. Is it not Döllinger? Is he a Catholic? You are as much so; and (to be "liberal") one degree more; for you have never been in the house, and so, have never thrown yourself out at the window.

One story is good, till another is told: I could easily furnish you with a sufficient reading on these points, if you had leisure or inclination to pursue them.†

4. You do not like Mr. Hobart Seymour: and I do not like a book of ours that I will name: "*The Comedy of Convocation*." I dislike it, as believing that satire, however just, never yet converted any one. It would not have converted Nathanael, or Nicodemus, or Saul. And the greater the truth, the greater the libel. Yet *ridentem dicere verum quid vetat?* His book is a clever *exposé* of your differences, with which the author was well acquainted. Certainly, no "Comedy" ever written is as comic as the reality. Mr. Seymour has been, if I remember, amply refuted in the *Dublin Review*, though I cannot lay my hand on the number. So have U. V. and W. in their anti-Roman misrepresentations.‡ I could hereafter send you references, if you cared to see them.

\* These words were not in the original letter; but they are inserted as necessary to a clear division of the subject. The letters were written amid the press of other employments. More leisure would have dictated that my friend's objections should have been disposed of, before noticing the differences agitating his own communion.

† Since the first edition was printed, a valuable work has appeared in English dress; Hergenröther's *Catholic Church and Christian State*: treating, with equal learning and clearness, several of the subjects touched upon in these letters.

‡ For the names given in the original, read: "So have others whom I could name."

5. The Bavarian bishops naturally complained of the countenance given to "Old Catholics," especially when there was a question of the "Old Catholics" being allowed to step into institutions, benefices, educational establishments, which had been founded for the Catholic faith. I do not see what you have in view when you allege this, unless you believe the "Old Catholics" to be Catholics. This you surely do not? They are New Protestants. Imagine a writer adducing the fact that Henry VIII. bestowed abbey-lands on his Court minions, and that the Pope of the day complained, in proof that the "Church of Rome" was agitated by differences. How would that argument look? Imagine the English Government proposing to give the church and schools of your place \* to the Independents. Would not you petition? And what would you think of me, if I used your petition as a proof of disunion in your church, and said, significantly: "It has a strange look?"

6. We come down to Signor Minghetti's speech, and the telegram; with which I am only acquainted through your favourable notice. We are well accustomed to such utterances. I notice them now, because you do, and I would not seem to pass over any of your authorities. You probably do not lay much stress on the news of Special Correspondents, and anonymous senders of telegrams, who doubtless mean well, but sometimes report very ill. If there are any "episcopal tyrants," I am sorry for it: but I wait to be informed, and am by no means agitated. What the laity are, who are friends of the Italian Government, I thought you knew pretty well. The tyranny seems to me to be on the side of those who dissolve convents and send nuns adrift, turn religious houses into barracks and stables, and perform those other benevolent and "liberal" acts, of which we might make a beautiful list from the events of the last few years. See the *Civiltà Cattolica* and the *Tablet*, nay, the *Times*, *passim*.

And now, is this indeed all you have to bring in support of your assertion? The differences in the English Church, you say, are as nothing compared with those which agitate the Church of Rome. A statement so startling ought to

\* The place where my friend lives was named in the original.

rest on authorities quite irrefragable. Let me summarise your authorities. They stand thus: (1) A bit from the history of two hundred years ago, by an anonymous encyclopædist, which turns out to be the exact reverse of the case; (2) the ignorant, I am loth to say wilful, mis-statement of an apostate, ignoring the plainest distinction, on which, therefore, I have insisted; (3) a book, supposed to emanate from another apostate, containing charges refuted by works you do not seem to have read; (4) a book from which you do not care to quote (and no wonder), and of which, though I have heard it characterised, I can only state my belief that you would find it refuted in the periodical I have named; (5) a protest of Catholic bishops against non-Catholic intrusion, so strangely misinterpreted by you, that I find it hard, unless you mistake terms, to think you serious; (6) an anonymous writer in a journal, "taken hap-hazard,"\* mentioning equally anonymous episcopal tyrants, whom I will believe in when found, and who, when found, will just prove their own personal defects, and neither less nor more.

If I had made a statement regarding, *e.g.*, Anglican dis-unions, and then found myself obliged to seek shelter behind so thin a defence; to pick up scraps, and go to encyclopædias, and quote the personal impressions of a couple of Anglicans who had become Wesleyans or freethinkers, and make extracts from nameless correspondents of the *Record*, or the *Rock*—I candidly own, that I should feel no small regret in having made the original assertion.

You are young in the trade of a public accuser, and are, moreover, well worthy of a better employment. I should be sorry to class you with Kingsley, Lord Redesdale, and others, in their involuntary, unconscious benefactions to the Catholic Church. You did not wish "to express the slightest hostility to Romanists." Yet your inevitable argument is this: Romanists profess to be united, and are for ever throwing their unity and our disunion in our teeth. But the profession is a false one, and they must know it; therefore they are dishonest. For a "Romanist" of moderate intelligence could hardly be unaware that he belonged to a disunited communion, any more than a man could be un-

\* His own expression, while quoting his newspaper authority.

aware that he had thin hair, or a cast in his eye. If you did not mean to suggest this conclusion, I am glad of it: it certainly seemed to follow from what you said. "It had a strange look."

Believe me, all who are in "the Church of Rome" were never more united than to-day. Internal dissensions are disintegrating other communions; or they are kept together by the grasp of the civil power. With us, the centripetal force comes from the mercy and grace of Him *qui facit unius moris in domo*. The weight of social persecution that is upon us, does but compact that unity firmer, as by hydraulic pressure. If there are false brethren among us, they are as invisible to me as the tyrant-bishops of your un-named authority. It is now, as in St. Paul's days, "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." And the source in which to seek this marvellous unity, so as to account for it, is the divine all-prevailing prayer of our Blessed Lord. We are a copy on earth, militant and struggling, of the Divine Unity in heaven. "That they may be one, as We are One . . . that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." This is the demonstration, outward and unmistakeable, that the Paraclete of truth resides within.

"Thou that seest many things, wilt Thou not observe them?"

May you one day learn, to your great advantage, that such words are words of truth and soberness.

## VIII.

It is worth while to make a few reflections on the foregoing correspondence. The points obvious at first sight are these:

I. My friend, like so many others, fails to see the distinction between questions that are of faith, or touch on faith, and open questions or opinions. It was pre-eminently the effect of the so-called Reformation, in its evil working, to confuse between these two; to take away the soundings and obliterate the land-marks. No wonder, then, that a layman, with a very preoccupied life, should superficially apply to one what would be true only of the

other. It may here be repeated, that the very office of General Councils and dogmatic definitions is to settle disputes, proclaim definitions, and insure that "profound calm" which I never asserted to exist unbroken, inasmuch as no one could say that men would not go out from us, or trouble us before they went (1 St. John ii. 19).

II. He fails, further, to see the plain distinction between differences which have "agitated the Church of Rome" *before* the decision of the final appeal, and those which for three hundred years have agitated his own communion *after* the decision of such appeal as Henry VIII. afforded, or regardless of its decisions. Could it be said, *Convocatio locuta est, causa finita est? Regina locuta est* is more to the purpose; yet even here, though the dogmatic decisions of the Privy Council have all the force of law, they have not (how could they have?) either hold upon the conscience, or the gift of appeasing it.

Differences which have agitated minds in the Church, prove (1) the tendency to division existing in any body of men, owing to the manifold diversities of character; (2) the consequent necessity of an infallible tribunal of final appeal; (3) the perfect adaptation to human needs in the establishment of such a final appeal in the Holy See; (4) the manifest operation of Grace, in the calm which ensues, after whatever amount of discussion and agitation, when Peter has once spoken. To suppose no discussion, and no agitation, on points so affecting man's relations with God and with eternity, as those defined by Councils and Popes, would be to suppose man indifferent to the highest department of thought and inquiry. The Catholic Church would then be an assemblage of two hundred millions of Gallios, caring "for none of these things." Her calm would be a calm frozen, or fossilized; cold, stagnant, and dead. It is not this we claim. But we say that our Lord, in the person of His Vicar, arises and rebukes the winds and the waves, and immediately there is a great calm: so great that others, refusing to acknowledge it as a divine gift and blessing, are fain to account for it by a theory. This pretended unity, they say, is stagnation of intellect, or imperious sacerdotalism. There are murmurs, not loud but deep, could we but hear them. Minghetti says it, and

the *Times'* correspondent. Or, lastly, a subtle infidelity is at work ; or it is indifference, with no true care to believe, and therefore no disposition to stir.

III. My friend has, naturally from his unhappy position, too faint a perception of the grievousness of the charge he has brought. He is so accustomed to differences and divisions among his co-religionists, he lives in such an atmosphere of doubtfulness, contradiction, alternate compromise and contention ; in society, he so often meets people who are obliged to keep clear of the one agitating topic because it is a "religious difficulty," that he hardly understands our asking for his meaning when he has asserted that the Church of God is like his own communion.

He who is giddy, thinks the world goes round.

This is one of the worst results of the evil work of evil men three centuries back. They took away the key of knowledge, and hampered the lock. Not only did they rob men of their faith ; they did even more. They wore out of men's minds the very perception that supernatural faith was of any necessity, or supernatural unity of faith. Instead of conformity to revelation, they tried to bring in mere "uniformity" of man with his fellows. The history of the established religion is that of compromise on essential truth : "Let it be neither thine nor mine." Her articles are "articles of peace"—"where is no peace." And the disastrous effect of such a training on the minds of its disciples is, that

(a) It deprives them, when consistently adopted, of the object on which to exercise the gift of faith, and so renders them unable to put in motion one of the highest functions of the Christian soul. For how can any one make an act of faith in an opinion? The two things are not co-ordinate ; the one is not to be elicited by the other.

(b) It brings them into a false perspective of the relation of faith to practice. "Without faith it is impossible to please God," is a truth necessarily obscured where faith subsides into religious opinion. "Faith that worketh by charity" is replaced by opinions which may or may not be incidentally true, and a goodness which perhaps has a large



infusion of the natural. Men adopt half of the dictum, from which they would recoil in its entirety :

For modes of faith let senseless bigots fight ;  
He can't be wrong whose life is in the right.

(c) Inasmuch as it teaches them to undervalue faith and unity in their Catholic fellow-countrymen, it hides from them also the guilt and the misery of any one who sins away those great gifts. They cannot see, that to abandon the faith, and to rend the seamless robe, are flagrant sins, consequent on other and previous sins. On the contrary, the sinner is one with whom they instantly fraternise. No sooner do tidings come, that some priests in Milan have rebelled against authority, than Mr. Gladstone sends them a subscription, *pour encourager les autres*. No sooner did Döllinger cast himself loose from the Church, than a high Anglican divine proposed him for a degree at Oxford. The Pope, as Swift said, throws his weeds to them over the wall ; and each weed, as it comes, they plant thankfully in their garden. While, therefore, they would take themselves to task for any aspersion on the moral or social character of others, they have no corresponding sense of the evil of traducing their neighbours in things spiritual.

Throughout, I have regarded the error of my friend as deserving notice, on account of his personal character. As to others, more reckless, and apparently less conscientious, their falsehoods have a vitality and persistency that would make one almost despair to convince them. Circumstances may render it a duty in this or that instance to notice their misrepresentations, for the well-meaning victims whom they mislead. But it would demand a special vocation to pursue them, up and down platforms and newspapers, through the doublings and windings of their versatile mis-statements. He who would give himself to that task, has a busy life before him.

Meanwhile, our probation wears away, and "the Judge standeth before the door," whose warning is : "By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned."

ANSWER  
TO A RECENT SERMON OF THE  
PROTESTANT  
BISHOP OF MANCHESTER.

BY

W. H. ANDERDON, M.A.

PRIEST OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS.

MANCHESTER: JOHN HEYWOOD, DEANSGATE, AND  
THOMAS WALKER, OLDHAM STREET.

LONDON: BURNS & OATES.

---

1876.



## ANSWER, ETC.

---

Controversy has been well termed the "luxury of the idle." He who engages in it of his free choice, must have not only a taste for such employment, but some leisure on his hands. If, moreover, "when men come to understand each other's terms, they find that controversy is either superfluous, or hopeless," a polemical writer or speaker will generally return home, after his best efforts, to discover that he has been beating the air.

The case, however, is altered, when controversy is neither spontaneous nor unprovoked; when definite charges are brought against the Church, ranging over whole departments of her teaching and practice, or taking up an isolated point or the verdict to be passed on some individual among her Saints and Doctors. "There is a time to speak, and a time to keep silence;" and in such case, the time to be silent seems past: there is not only a time, but a call, to speak. The charge may be puerile in a high degree; but the most puerile charges cannot be safely left to take their chance, if they appeal to a busy and undiscerning multitude. Hence, the priest who remains silent when he has a fair call or challenge to expound the truth, may be sometimes classed among those who

ἀφ' ἡσυχίου ποδὸς  
δύσκληιαν ἐκτῆσαντο καὶ ῥαθυμίαν.

Such a challenge has lately been given in Manchester. The local press of Jan. 20th, reports words as emanating from one who represents the established Church in this place. They were spoken at the opening of a church named St. Clement's, and touched upon three distinct points, beside some minor issues. I propose to examine these three in order, and shall first set about to prove, against Dr. Fraser's first assertion.

## I.

## THE CATHOLICITY OF ST. CLEMENT OF ROME.

"In St. Clement's Epistles," Dr. Fraser asserted, "they would look in vain for any of those doctrines which were now considered the distinctive doctrines of the Church of Rome."

The speaker reiterated his words:

"He thought it might be said fearlessly, that it would be impossible to find the slightest trace of what might be called the distinctive doctrines of the Church of Rome in the writings of St. Clement.

The writings especially referred to, (the Saint's two Epistles to the Corinthians), had been characterised in an earlier passage of the sermon as "most precious relics of primitive Christianity." It becomes, therefore, important to ascertain what we find in them, and what we might reasonably expect to find, and do not. To begin with the latter point: ought we to be disappointed, and should we be moved towards the Right Rev. speaker's conclusion, if we did not find such distinctive doctrines in these epistles?

In other words, did the occasion of writing them fairly call for the enunciation of distinctive doctrines? If it did, and the enunciation was absent, we might indeed be surprised. It would be astonishing to find, in the Dogmatic Bull of the Immaculate Conception, prominence given to the Sacrament of Penance, or to Indulgences, and little notice of the special doctrine for which the Bull was issued.

On the other hand, in that golden treatise, the "Imitation," by A'Kempis, at least in the three first books, we are not surprised to find distinctive doctrines, as Purgatory, the Mass, the veneration of relics, coming in here and there merely, and as it were by the way. The interior life of the soul formed his subject; an ample one of itself. Starting from principles common to all Catholics, penetrated by their influence, as appears at every turn, he simply treats the matter in hand, like other writers of the school called "mystic," expressing doctrines always understood, just in so far as his purpose demanded. In this respect, his writing presents no slight parallel to the Epistles now under

review. What was the Catholicity of A'Kempis, we know from his other treatises, written in the same simple, pious spirit, but more "distinctive."

Now St. Clement wrote to the Church of Corinth on no point of doctrine. His Epistles are, indeed, highly authoritative; for he asserts, or rather takes for granted, the power that is in him to depose the bishop of that place, as we shall see. But he writes a pathetic exhortation to unity, not a formula of faith. It reminds us of the tone of St. Paul, who, while he could have delivered the contumacious to Satan, that they might learn not to blaspheme,\* chose rather to be "as a little one in the midst of his brethren, as if a nurse should cherish her children."†

The purpose of St. Clement's writing being so undogmatic, it is plain that whatever of distinctive doctrine we find in him, has the special value of being incidental and undesigned. Writers on Christian evidence (Paley, for example, or Lardner), lay stress on the undesigned coincidences between one gospel and another, or between St. Paul's Epistles and the Acts. The argument holds good in this case also. Casual mention of doctrines and practise, without staying to prove or enlarge on them, shows that they were in vogue, so to say, and in force; that they were acknowledged and held, both by him who wrote, and by those who received his epistle. Had it been otherwise, we should have found them enforced; and, historically, we should know they had been opposed. A bishop, for example, issuing his Pastoral, containing the dispensations for Lent, evidences that both he and his flock believe the institution of the annual fast, and the power of dispensing. If he were writing a polemical treatise, he would set to work to prove both.

With this principle in our minds—that all the traces of dogma are *ex abundanti*, more than we might have looked for—let us turn to a notice which St. Clement gives us, of the practise of Confession.

"As long as we are in this world, let us repent with our whole hearts of the evil deeds we have done in the flesh;

\* 1 Cor. v. 5. 1 Tim. i. 20.

† 1 Thess. ii. 7. St. Jerome remarks on the great similarity of St. Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians with St. Paul's to the Hebrews.

that we may be saved by the Lord, whilst we have time for repentance, For after we have gone out of this world, we can no longer there *confess or do penance*.”\*

Not the slightest trace here of distinctive doctrine? He must be fearless indeed, who asserts it. Why, here is the nucleus of a whole series of Lenten or Mission sermons. You may imagine a missionary father, Redemptionist or Capuchin, mapping out the discourses he is to give in Rome, Paris, Vienna, or St. George's, or Moorfields, upon this text alone. You will find the same thing repeated, an hundred times over, in Segneri and Bourdaloue. “Come to confession,” they cry; “and that, while you have time and grace. The priest is at your disposal, the tribunal of penance awaits you. Let your repentance be universal, and your confession; extending over all the evil deeds you have done in the flesh. If you delay you are sure neither of time nor of grace. The enemy of your souls is waiting, too: he desires to blind you, to amuse you, that you may trifle with the acceptable time. Seek ye the Lord, while He may be found; for when once you have gone out of this world, you enter the irrevocable state, where there is no more confession, nor penance, nor opportunity of retrieving the past: for there, as the tree falleth, so it shall be.”

Let any reader of this recall the language he has heard at the last mission he attended: and our missions are largely attended by non-Catholics too. He will recognise St. Clement's exhortation put into fuller words.

Or, let me suppose, without irreverence, that great Pope and Martyr to descend for awhile from his glorious place in heaven. He comes, say, to Manchester, in semblance of

\* Ep. ii. ad. Cor. n. 8. We might add other passages in the same Epistle: cf. n. n. 51, 52, 57, a collation of which would strengthen the text quoted: but the proof would over-run our space. Jacobson unworthily asks, on the text quoted above, whether these words of St. Clement do not discountenance the doctrine of Purgatory, etc. The two points of teaching have no relation to each other. No Catholic ever asserted that a soul departing in mortal sin (and therefore, according to St. Clement, needing confession and penance in order to salvation) passed into purgatory, or had any benefit from the Church's prayers. This is one among the many instances in which men, who ought to know their subject better, will risk the utter confusion attendant on the most obvious exposure, in order to have their little fling at the truths announced by God's Church.

mortal flesh; and with some such thought as this; Let me see how the Christians of to-day are practising the timely confession and penance I inculcated on those of Corinth, eighteen hundred years ago.\* He enters the Old Church of Manchester. Because it is the old one, surely it will have kept up the traditions and discipline of antiquity. It shall be on a Saturday; the principal confession-day (he would naturally suppose), in preparation for next morning. I hardly know how to go on, with due gravity. An old woman is sweeping out the place, and the clerk is looking for a register. What account would they give of the confessions likely to be heard there during the course of the day?

Disappointed—if I may still use such language—he then turns to the Cathedral of Salford, and so makes a tour of the Catholic churches through Manchester. Ah, there, I hope, the Saint is consoled. There, at all events, he finds confession and penance recognised. He finds the faithful preparing for confession, making their confessions, thanking our Lord for their absolution, strengthening their good resolutions in quiet prayer. He finds them kneeling, each in turn, at the side of God's priests, as the faithful had done in his own day of persecution, and were laughed at by the pagan Romans, with ribald jests for doing it. In a word; in Dr. Fraser's Church, St. Clement would recognise nothing of what he had inculcated in the words I have quoted: "nothing distinctive," certainly. In the Catholic churches, he would recognise, very distinctively, the power of the keys, which he had wielded, and the practice of self-accusation, which he had inculcated: and all this, going on, irrespective of time, after the conversion of the Empire as before it; after St. Austin's coming hither, and the Norman Invasion, and the Commonwealth, the Battle of the Boyne, and the Reform Bill—while races change, and kingdoms rise and fall: simply because it is a divine ordnance, sent forth to perform its course, "all days, even to the consummation of the world."†

\* The date of St. Clement's martyrdom is generally put at A.D. 100.

† This is an argument parallel to that of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, and with an equally practical bearing. "If ever thou art sojourning in



Confession has relation to Holy Communion; inasmuch as a chief office of the one Sacrament is, to prepare souls for the other: and Holy Communion is the giving of the true Body of our Lord, made present by the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. Here again, St. Clement's subject did not lead him, certainly did not pledge him, to notice these doctrines; and what he says is, so to speak, "out of the abundance of the heart," and superabundantly for our purpose. Yet he speaks of the Adorable Eucharist, under its two-fold aspect of Sacrifice and Sacrament.

(2.) He notices the Holy Sacrifice, in more than a passing way. "All things which the Lord has commanded [us] to perform, we ought to do in order. He has made it a precept, that the oblations and services be performed at stated times, and not rashly, nor out of order, but at times any city," says the Saint, in his catechetical instructions, "enquire not simply where the Lord's house is (for the sects of the profane also attempt to call their own dens, houses of the Lord), nor merely, Where is the Church"—for, it might be added, here in England, Queen Elizabeth and her disciples claimed that name for their new community—"but, Where is the Catholic Church? For this is the special name of this holy (Church) and mother of us all, which is indeed the Spouse of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Only-begotten Son of God."—[S. Cyr. Hierus. Catech. xviii. 25.] Let us put this antient principle to a "modern instance." Go to any town in England, where, we will suppose, there is only one Catholic mission. You wish to hear Mass next morning, or the next Sunday. Call a cab, get into an omnibus, or enquire of the first person you meet in the street. "Drive me to the Catholic Church." Set me down as near as you can, to the Catholic Church." "Will you, please, direct me to the Catholic Church?" Is there any ambiguity in the answer? Does not every one know at once the place you mean? Where is the cabman who ever said: "Do you mean the Anglo-Catholic Church? for there is a splendid new building where they go on with vestments, and such like, and I hear they call themselves so?" By no means: he has too much good sense. He drives you straight to the place which is in communion with St Peter. And if you were to object: 'Why, I meant the Ritualists, or the Catholic Apostolics;' he would have his rejoinder. I hope without forcible language: Then why didn't you say so?"

Lawyers have an axiom, *Additio probat minoritatem*. It has its place here. The Catholic Church is the Church, and has the title-deeds. The Anglo-Catholic, or the Catholic Apostolic are imitations, convicted as such by their later compound name. A sense of this has made them turn round upon the true heir, and claim the spiritual property, designating the Catholic as the "Roman Catholic:" as though there could be a Catholic apart from Rome.

and hours previously fixed; also, where, and by whom, He would have them celebrated, He has Himself defined by His supreme will: that all things being done purely and holily according to his good pleasure, might be acceptable to, His will. They therefore who make their oblations (*προσφορὰς*) at the appointed times, are accepted and blessed; for they who follow the laws of the Lord, do not err. For the chief priest has his own offices assigned to him, and to the priests their especial place is appointed; and the Levites [or deacons] have charge of their ministering: the layman is bound by the precepts for the laity.\*

Who that has ever seen a pontifical high mass, could hesitate to recognise it in this description? No visitor to the very antient church of St. Clement in Rome, where a portion of his relics repose, will fail to remember the high altar, of antique form, supporting a canopy on four columns, which are connected with one another at the top by iron rods; on these last are the rings, still remaining, that anciently upheld curtains for enclosing the altar from public view during the consecration. That old church (beneath which they have recently discovered two others, more ancient still, and all dedicated under the invocation of St. Clement), is the silent counterpart of the description here given from St. Clement's own words. When, on the anniversary of his martyrdom, a Cardinal comes to celebrate High Mass, surrounded by clergy and acolyths, the antient marble chair awaits him in the centre of the apse, while the Epistle is chanted from one *ambo*, and the Gospel from the other. It is taking up a link from bygone centuries; or rather, it is the continuance of the same indefectible body, with her changeless rite of Sacrifice. *Tempus non occurrit Ecclesie*. St. Clement, were he still in the flesh, could say Mass there to-morrow, as he did over the body of St. Peter, *ad catacumbas*, eighteen centuries ago.

The meaning of the two words here used by St. Clement, *προσφορὰ* and *λειτουργία*, is known to all scholars. The first, "offering," is the oblation of the elements to be consecrated on the altar, and the offering them in sacrifice to the Eternal Father, when by consecration they have become

\* S. Clem. Ep. 1 ad. Cor. § 40.

the Body and Blood of His Co-eternal Son. The second, "performance of duty or service," is applied especially to the function of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. A learned Lutheran writer, Grabe, acknowledges so much. Commenting on this very passage, he says: "Inasmuch as the author of this Epistle seems to have been that same Clement, of whose name Paul wrote to the Philippians, c. iv., v. 3., that it was written in the Book of Life, and as he [Clement] wrote the words just quoted two or three years after the martyrdom of the Apostles Peter and Paul, and twenty before the death of St. John, there is scarce any room left to doubt, that this doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice proceeded from the Holy Apostles themselves, and must therefore be entirely held; although no passage could be quoted for it from the Apostles or Prophets.\* He adds: "It is certain, that Irenæus, and all the Fathers whose writings we have, whether coeval with the Apostles, or immediately succeeding them, held the Holy Eucharist to be the Sacrifice of the new law,† and offered the bread and wine upon the altar as sacred gifts to God the Father; before consecration indeed as the first fruits of created things, in acknowledgment of His supreme dominion over all things; but, after consecration, as the Mystical Body and Blood of Christ, to represent the bloody oblation of His personal Body and Blood on the Cross, and to obtain the benefits of His death for all for whom it might be offered." [Grabe, *loc. cit.*] The only touch of Protestantism here is the distinction which the writer apparently draws between the "mystical" and the "personal" Body of our Lord. But Grabe's Protestantism, mild and candid as it is, may be said to enhance the value of the passage: it renders his testimony, a little reluctant, perhaps, but disinterested and inevitable. And the latter sentence here quoted from him is too distinct to be referred merely to a "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," by which the Common Prayer Book seeks to evaporate and explain away the Sacrifice of the new law; removing it from the region of

\* Grabe, *Annotat in Iren. adv. Hær.* lib. iv. Ed. Oxon, 1762, p. 328.

† The very words of the Council of Trent, repeated in the *Catechismus ad Parochos*.

real existence to one dependent on the condition of the souls of communicants.\* Let me here give, in illustration, words from another Lutheran writer. Would that all who rank themselves as protesters against the Holy See, were inspired by his candour, or took the pains to share his learning, before they committed themselves in speech or print! Leibnitz, then writes: "The passages of the Holy Fathers are *without number*, in which it is said that Christ is daily immolated in the Sacrament for the people, as Augustine says: that it is an Unbloody Sacrifice, when we call that which is produced the Body and Blood of Christ, as Cyril says; that in the supersubstantial Bread there is both holocaust and remedy, as Cyprian says; and [similiar] statements which are found continually."†

\* "The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received—*by the faithful*—in the Lord's Supper. Anglican Catechism.

† Leibnitz, *Systema Theologiæ*, p. 228, Par. 1819. We will here notice the "Centuriators" of Madgeburg. These were "four not unlearned primitive Lutherans," as Father Cressy calls them, who undertook an historical account of the doctrines professed, and rites practised, in each successive century; drawing their materials from the antient Fathers Councils, and ecclesiastical writers. To each century they appended a special chapter of controversy against the Catholic Church; this they entitle: The declension, or deterioration, of doctrine, containing "inconvenient" or "incommodious" opinions; "the stubble, or errors of doctors [in each age]; which errors have been openly delivered by them in their writings."

These gentlemen begin by expressing their dislike both of St. Peter and St. James, in whose epistles they find several things very incommodious, or inconvenient; especially what St. James says about justification by works, and not by faith alone. They find the works of the earliest Fathers equally "inconvenient." They find St. Ignatius the Martyr (the disciple of John the Evangelist) "speaking of the Christian Sacrifice as if he were a very Papist." And of St. Irenæus they say: "We may perceive by his writings that he had several incommodious opinions, and that of no small moment. That passage savours of novelty, which we find in the published copies, where, speaking of the Roman Church, he says: 'To this Church, by reason, of its most potent principality, it is necessary that every other Church, that is, all believers, whosoever they are, should have recourse; inasmuch as the tradition which came from the Apostles has been entirely preserved in it.'" Father Cressy gives other quotations from the Centuriators to the same effect, and concludes with something of dry humour: "It is pity to proceed any further, in producing out of the

It may, therefore, be "fearlessly" answered to Dr. Fraser that we have found in St. Clement very distinctive Roman doctrine. The Sacrifice of the new law, which we call Mass, the immolation of our Lord upon the altar, independent of any act of faith, or any action whatsoever, on the part of the congregation or communicants, was the key of the position (so to say) in the warfare of worship—the *Cultur Kampf*—in England, at the so-called Reformation. This is easy of proof. Henry VIII, indeed, died a bad Catholic, believing in what he had destroyed, and leaving by his will a foundation for perpetual masses to be said at Windsor for his soul. But no sooner did they who surrounded the young Edward begin to act for him, than their first movement was against the altar. The change of one religion into another turned very much upon the denial of "the daily Sacrifice." It was annihilated; it disappeared in a communion-service which speaks with stammering lips, and wavers between assertion and denial. Thenceforth, the mass-book, the mass-priest, the mass-house, became terms of contemptuous reproach. The first were collected from all quarters, by royal and episcopal mandates, to be defaced and burnt. The second was hunted by pursuivants and bloodhounds, dragged from his hiding place, drawn on a hurdle, hanged, and quartered. The third was burnt in successive riots, or regarded by the people, descendants of devout worshippers at Mass, with a horror and dread proportioned to their ignorance. In a word, to believe the Sacrifice, the *λειτουργία*, was characteristic of the antient Faith; to disbelieve and vilify it, of the new royal creed. The conclusion need hardly be drawn. In St. Clement's Epistle we find the Adorable Sacrifice in full vigour and

following centuries the sometimes sad, but most often angry, complaints and acknowledgments made by these honest German writers, how generally their patriarch Luther's doctrines have been prejudged and condemned by the Fathers and Doctors of God's Church, and the faith of the present Roman Church asserted. The further they proceed in their collection, a greater number of yet more severe judges they discover; till, in a short time, they cannot find one to speak a good word for them. And this, like a conscionable jury, they attest; inasmuch as one would be almost tempted to suspect they had been secretly bribed by the pope to publish their own condemnation."—*Church History of Brittany (Britain) Preface*, n. n. 31-35, Ed, 1668.

constant celebration; and hence his doctrine, as we might expect in a Pope, is distinctively "Romish."

(8) The challenge given by Dr. Fraser is universal, as regards St. Clement's writings. The slightest trace, he says, of the distinctive Romish doctrine is not to be found there. He seems to extend his assertion wider than to the two Epistles to the Corinthians. I turn, therefore, to another Epistle, assigned by some writers to the Saint, though aware that its claim to be his has been also powerfully assailed. It is the Second Epistle to St. James; and the special passage concerns the reservation of the adorable elements after Mass. I should not have quoted it, inasmuch as it is most important to keep the line severely drawn between such works of the Fathers as are undoubtedly genuine, and those that are not. But capital has been made by one Lutheran writer, at least (Kemnitz), out of the passage, as being genuine, and making, he thinks, for his cause. He has been encountered by two well known names, Bellarmine and Sardagna.\* If the Epistle is genuine, let us see whether Kemnitz can fairly deduce his conclusion from it, which is, that the elements were not anciently reserved. If not St. Clement's, though certainly primitive, the document is at least a collateral testimony on a point involving both doctrine and practice, whether for or against. Here are Bellarmine's words:

"Clement of Rome is first quoted [*i.e.* by Kemnitz], who, in his second epistle [to St. James] enjoins, that so many holocausts be placed on the altar, as may seem sufficient for the people: but that if ought should remain after communion, it should not be reserved but consumed, by the clergy. I answer, that this passage must be understood, to the exception of those particles that were to be reserved for the communion of the sick; for he [St. Clement] did not wish that too great an amount of the Eucharist should be reserved.† Moreover, I clearly prove from Clement himself the duty of reserving the Eucharist: for in that second epistle not far from the beginning, he thus speaks:

\* Bellarm. c. ii. De Sac. Euch. lib. iv. c. iii. Sardagna, Tract vi., art. iv. contro. x. cclix.

† Compare the rubrics of the Roman Missal, *De Defectibus*, especially iii. and x.

'The Sacraments of the divine mysteries are entrusted to the three degrees [of the clergy], the Priest, the Deacon, and the Minister [or Sub-deacon]; who ought to keep, with fear and trembling, the remaining fragments of the Lords Body; so that no corruption be found in the *sac-rarium*: lest if they act with negligence, a grievous outrage (*injuria*) be offered to the body of the Lord.' Bellarmine then quotes, as being also St. Clement's, the Apostolical Constitutions, lib. viii. c. 13 or (or 20), which prescribe as follows: Let the Bishop give the [consecrated] oblation, saying, The Body of Christ; and let him who receiveth say, Amen.\* And when all, both men and women, have communicated, let the deacons take what remaineth, and carry it into the *pastophoria*."†

We cannot, of course, lay stress on this passage from the Epistle to St. James, because of the arguments which have made critics doubt its being by St. Clement.‡ It is

\* The Constitution here adds the rubric on administering the chalice by the deacon, as was then the discipline of the Church; and prescribes the recitation of the thirty-third Psalm during the communion of the faithful.

† What the *pastophorium* is, Jerome explains, in his commentary on the twenty-second chapter of Isaias, where he says that the *pastophorium* signifies the tabernacle, or inner chamber, where the prefect of the [Jewish] temple resides. Hence, therefore, the Apostles called that vessel [receptacle] in which the Sacrament was enclosed to be reserved, *pastophorium*, because in that Sacrament Christ is truly [present], who is the true Prefect of the temple. Now the works of Clement, although they are not received by all cannot be repudiated by Kemnitz, inasmuch as (we shall see below) he uses the testimony of this very Clement against the Catholics. Bellarm. c. ii. De Sacram. Euch lib. iv. c. iv.

‡ On this subject of ancient works, assigned to the Fathers, which a later criticism has numbered among the supposititious, two things may be remarked. (1) It is always better to be on the safe side, and disposed rather to reject than to accept: a critical severity enhances the value of such works as are undoubtedly genuine. (2) it may happen, as it does from time to time, that the discovery of other and independent MSS. or fresh collateral evidence establishes the claim of a treatise hitherto doubted. Thus the treatise of St. Clement on Virginity (a very "distinctively Romish doctrine") after being long reckoned spurious, or at least doubtful, has lately been rehabilitated. See Migne *Patres Græci*, vol. 1. col. 350, for a translation of the two supposed Epistles of St. Clement on this subject. It was made by Cardinal de Villecourt, who prefixes a defence of their authenticity. Mgr. Malou, Bishop of Bruges, had previously edited a translation of his own.

certainly a very ancient and valuable testimony to the point under consideration; but we may well afford to dispense with it, if the reader prefers; for Dr. Fraser has been sufficiently confuted under the two preceding heads. St. Clement has been shown to be distinctively Roman, or (according to the bishop's courteous term) "Romish," on points so distinctive as Confession and Mass. I now advance to a further and a final point, as it is also the strongest.

(4) The claim of jurisdiction over other bishops, especially the bishops of other Patriarchates, is about the most Roman, or Romish, doctrine one could name. It is the very essence of Popery. For the Pope means, not a bishop merely, nor the Bishop of Rome, nor the Patriarch of the West—all which he is, inclusively, as the greater contains the less. Popery is the assertion that the Pope has jurisdiction over all other bishops, East, West, or wherever bishops are; that he can control their appointments, which is subject to his consent, implicit and virtual; that he can depose them, for very grave reasons, as St. Clement implies in the passage cited; that he can exercise episcopal functions in the diocese of each one; that he is a "bishop of bishops," as we shall see when we come to St. Gregory. It is possible, that in the early days of St. Clement, before Dr. Fraser supposes the Holy see to have become "the great arrogant Church of Rome," such claim could be advanced? Yet it is certain, by St. Clement's own words. Nay, the power is not claimed, which would imply opposition, and the need of assertion and proof. It is quietly referred to, as a thing existing and uncontested

The discovery of St. Clement's first Epistle to the Corinthians, in its entire state, is due to an Anglican, Patrick Young, who found it in 1633, at the end of a copy of the Sacred Scriptures which had been brought from Alexandria to England; he published it (I think) at Oxford. The date of the M.S. is that of the Council of Nicæa. The anachronisms, which form the ground of objection to St. Clement's Epistle to St. James, may have been later interpolations; a fate to which ancient treatises were often exposed. Thus, the "Recognitions" of St. Clement have been altered by the Ebionites to favour their heresy; and the Apostolical Constitutions are said, by the Greeks of the Trullan Synod (in 692) to have been corrupted by heretics. The religious opinions of the critics, however, would hardly make them competent judges.



with the same incidental force of evidence, of which I have spoken on the former points. His words are these: "It would be no small sin in us, if we should cast out of the Episcopacy those who blamelessly and holily offer the gifts."\* Cast out of the Episcopacy? and cast out the bishop of a church of men so self-sufficient as the Corinthians? Let me beg the reader to weigh these words. Why, nothing that we shall by and bye read of St. Gregory exceeds this assertion of authority. Imagine the Archbishop of Canterbury sending to appease a disturbance among the clergy of Brussels, or Paris; or, to take an instance where there is identity of religion, among the Episcopalians of New York. Imagine him to say: "I shall not incur the responsibility of deposing the bishop of the place, unless I find that he has really transgressed in some important duty." The assumption, of course, would be entertained with laughter. But what if, on the contrary, we found his letters received with the deepest reverence, and frequently read on the Sunday services, until, eighty years afterwards, a bishop† of the see to which it was written, testified that it had become a time-honoured custom to do so? Yet so stands the case with St. Clement. Here is a man, at a distance, uncertain of his own life, even if we suppose him to write during the short and tranquil reign of Nerva: for pagan Rome was a volcano of persecution that might open at any moment upon the Christians; and the succeeding emperor, Trajan, did

\* S. Clem. Epist. i. ad Cor. c. xlv. Cotelierius, (*Patr. Apostol. in loc.*) shows that the *δῶρα* here spoken of were Eucharistic gifts, oblations made by the faithful, and given back to them in the Divine Gifts of the Body and Blood of our Lord. Dr. Jacobson assents to this, while he gives the interpretation of Burton, "who have undergone the duties of their episcopacy," and of Wake and Chevallier, "who have fulfilled the duties of their ministry;" vague and vapid renderings, indeed, which would not have contented these writers, had the controversy been between themselves and the Presbyterians.

† St. Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, writes, about A.D. 180, to St. Soter, Pope, saying that St. Clement's Epistle was read in that Church "from time immemorial," *i.e.* ever since it was written. Eusebius and St. Jerome say that the like honour was paid to it in many other churches, and that some would even have had it placed on the Canon of Scripture.

actually sent him to martyrdom. Yet, having the "sentence of death in himself," which deadens ambition in the most self-seeking and high-minded, with one foot in the grave, probably with both in the catacomb, he sufficiently indicates to the Corinthian church, that "the thunders of the Vatican," in modern phrase, were in his hand, though they slept; and that, if allegations had been proved against the bishop, that bishop would have found himself deprived of his office by the Holy See. Here then is the most distinctive of all distinctive Roman doctrines. Dr. Fraser has probably seldom been more unfortunate in any assertion; unless we except what he said, not long ago, about the Council of Nicæa, and thereby provoked the conclusive answer he received from Canon Toole.

In estimating the value of the testimonies given above, consider for a moment who were the writers. Can you ascend higher, or get nearer to inspiration itself? St. Irenæus was the disciple of St. Polycarp, the disciple of St. John. So that in St. Irenæus we have the doctrine of the Apostle at two removes. It would be a very early "Papal corruption" that should insinuate itself among these first links of Christian tradition. Did St. Irenæus begin it, or St. Polycarp? Which of them first declined from the teaching of their inspired master, "the disciple whom Jesus loved?" Either St. John's exposition of the words he had heard—"Thou art Cephas"—"Confirm thy brethren"—"Feed My sheep," was virtually this, that all the faithful, and every portion of the Church, must have recourse to the Church of Rome, and be obedient to its supremacy;\* or those other words of our Lord to St. Peter, concerning the Church to be built on him, "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," were falsified (I pray forgiveness for using a term, profane indeed, yet implied in the Anglican theory)—falsified within a century after they were spoken. Which alternative will Dr. Fraser, and such as think with him prefer?

So too of St. Clement, Nothing can be more express than the terms in which St. Irenæus mentions him "The third from the Apostles who obtained that episcopacy [of Rome] was Clement, who had seen and conferred with the

\* See the words of St. Irenæus, given below, p. 36.

blessed Apostles, and who still had before his eyes the familiar preaching and tradition of the Apostles: and not he alone; for many were then yet living, who had been instructed by the Apostles." Where is the voice raised against the distinctive doctrines we have heard from St. Clement, or the Authority we have seen him claim? St. Irenæus goes on to number the Popes in succession, down to his own cotemporary, St. Eleutherius, whom he reckons as twelfth from the Apostles, S.S. Peter and Paul. Then he says: "By this order, and by this succession, that tradition which is in the Church from the Apostles, and *the preaching of the truth*, have come down to us. And this is a most complete demonstration, that the vivifying faith is one and the same, which has been preserved in the Church, from the Apostles even unto now, and truthfully transmitted." Then he speaks of his own instructor in the faith. So also Polycarp, who not only had been instructed by Apostles, and had conversed with many who had seen the Lord, but was also appointed, by Apostles, Bishop of Smyrna in Asia, Him we saw in our early youth. The things which he had learned from the Apostles, those he uniformly taught, which also he delivered to the Church, which also alone are true. To these, all the churches throughout Asia, and Polycarp's successors down to this day, bear testimony; a testimony of truth much more trustworthy and faithful than Valentinus and Marcion, and the rest of the perverse thinkers."

"Wherefore," it is well to give his conclusion, though we might have drawn it for ourselves, "since there are such proofs to show, we ought not still to seek among others for truth, which it is easy to receive from the Church; seeing that into it, as into a rich repository, the Apostles have most fully brought together all, whatsoever is of the truth."\*

We may state his proposition, more briefly and technically; confining it to St. Clement, our immediate subject: The doctrine of the Apostles is true doctrine.  
St. Clement teaches the doctrine of the Apostles.  
St. Clement teaches true doctrine.

\* S. Iren. adv. Hær. lib. iii., c. 3., § 3, 4. c, 4, § 1.

Again:

The direct or incidental doctrine of St. Clement is true doctrine.

Confession, the Holy Sacrifice, and Papal Supremacy are the direct or incidental doctrine of St. Clement.

Confession, the Holy Sacrifice, and Papal Supremacy are true doctrine.

One would be glad to know where Dr. Fraser finds a flaw in this argument; and whether he will still fearlessly assert that the great Saint, whose name he takes in vain, has nothing in his writings of distinctive Roman teaching.

To return, before dismissing the subject, to non-Catholic writers, there is a passage in Milton's prose works, very germane to our purpose. His "Treatise of Prelatical Episcopacy" is all in the line of showing, that if you rely on the Fathers, you come to Popery. After commenting on the assertions of St. Ignatius for the authority of bishops, and on St. Irenæus, as being "so negligent in keeping the faith which they [the Apostles] wrote, as to say 'that the obedience of Mary was the cause of salvation to herself and all mankind,'" and so on, through other instances of his principle, he thus concludes:

"The plain truth is, that when any of our men, that are wedded to antiquity, come to dispute with a Papist, and leaving the Scriptures, put themselves without appeal to the sentence of Synods and Councils, using in the cause of Sion the hired soldiery of revolted Israel; where they give the Romanist one buff, they receive two counterbuffs.\*

What counterbuffs Dr. Fraser may hitherto have received, it is not for me to say. One or two more, I think, await him.

\* Milton's Prose Works, vol. ii., p. 436. Bohn's Standard Library.

## II.

## PAPAL SUPREMACY OF ST. GREGORY THE GREAT.

We have tested the general value of Dr. Fraser's confident assertions. Regarding the Epistles of St. Clement, we have heard him fearlessly assert that you would find nothing there of the distinctive doctrines of the Church of Rome; whereas, on examination, we found that St. Clement not only mentioned several Catholic doctrines in an undersigned, incidental way, but, moreover, witnessed to the consciousness of the power that was in him to depose bishops out of his own patriarchate. So that, instead of being not distinctive, he was most distinctive; and the Bishop's "fearlessness," would have been toned down to a more seemly caution by just a little reading. Now with unabated courage he goes on to St. Gregory the Great; and gives a passage, quoted a thousand times, on a moderate computation, and a thousand times, again, put in its true light. This we have to consider.

St. Gregory says, that any one who calls himself universal priest (*universalem sacerdotem*), or who desires so to call himself, is, in that self-exaltation, a forerunner of Antichrist. Perfectly true, in the letter: entirely forced, in the interpretation. True, as applied to John of Constantinople, to whom St. Gregory directs his axiom, or protest; and who was doing that very thing at the moment, without the shadow of a claim, except his influence with the Emperor. False, as implying an argument against the Supremacy of the Holy See. True, as applied to any one, East or West, who should claim such a title apart from the appointment of our Lord, the Source and dispenser of all power. False, not indeed in St. Gregory's lips, but in the interpretation put on his words by those who have jumped

at them, as seeming to authorise their theory of an Independent National Church. False, as any words may be falsified, as the words of the Sacred Scriptures themselves, when you isolate them, tear them out of their context, and refuse them the benefit of any consideration of circumstance, person, occasion, or idiom of language; "making the word of God of no effect" through men's traditions.

The points I desire to notice are the following; they shall stand in the form of questions:

1. What was the occasion of St. Gregory's words?
2. In what sense did he write them?
3. Did he refuse the authority as well as the title?
4. Did others attribute to the Pope both thing and title together?

We shall not be able to keep these four points very distinct in their treatment. Some of the passages now to be quoted will treat them together, and they will more or less interpenetrate. But, that we may clearly map out our subject, I will begin by a valuable passage from a German theologian, lately translated.

"Granted," says Dr. Hergenröther, "that some of the Fathers, such as St. Ambrose, St. Basil, and St. Leo, say that bishops and their authority are from God, they nowhere say that this authority is in *all its parts and immediately* from God. Other Fathers say that, on the contrary, it is derived from the Roman Pontiff. Either the Fathers in this contradict one another—a supposition neither well-grounded nor reverent—or we are to understand them to mean, that episcopal jurisdiction is derived *from God through the Pope*. St. Bonaventure and St. Thomas taught this doctrine; and, among the Fathers, Leo the Great and Gregory the Great; the latter of whom refused the title of 'Universal Bishop,' calling it unrighteous, but only in the sense imputed to it by the present opponents of the Vatican Council; namely, that of being, strictly speaking, the sole bishop. The Pope is bishop in his See of Rome, and must therefore leave their sees to the other bishops. He is, however, also the bishop of the Universal Church: as such he can investigate and pass judgment upon all matters of ecclesiastical jurisdiction; but he has not the right causelessly to withdraw from bishops the authority which they

lawfully possess. He is justly called Bishop of the Catholic, that is, of the Universal Church; a title which occurs in the Bull of the ratification of the Council of Trent, issued in 1564 by Pius IV.; also previously in the diplomas of Alexander III., A.D. 1162 and 1169, and as early as 1181 in the *Privilegium* granted by Innocent II. to St. Bernard. Gregory the Great, in opposition to Byzantine pride, took the title of Servant of the servants of God (*Servus servorum Dei*), but without intending to merge the dignity of his office in the humility of the appellation; he only refused the title of 'Ecumenical' Pope or Patriarch, in the sense in which he understood it. He called it blasphemous, when assumed by the Patriarch of Constantinople, whose throne had already been occupied by many heretics, and who took to himself what the Roman Pontiff was not willing to accept. The title of 'Universal Bishop' was of frequent occurrence as early as the eighth century. In 1418, the Faculty of Paris rejected the proposition of Huss, that the Pope was not 'Universal Bishop'; and the theologians of Alcalá, in 1564, rejected the proposition: "The Pope is not to be styled 'Universal Bishop,' since St. Gregory refused and abhorred the title," as a proposition bordering on heresy; while they clearly prove that Gregory the Great rejected the title in another meaning, not in the sense of his [not] having power over the whole Church. The Faculty of Paris in 1585, and that of Cologne, in 1617, acted in a similar manner. Here again, the weapons of old heretics are used to fight the battle of a new heresy."\*

A previous passage, slightly abridged, from the same essay, thus defines the Papal power:

"According to the doctrine of the Church, the power of the Popes is a *full* power, as it is called by the Council of Florence, because there is no power in the Church in which the Head of the Church does not take part. It is a *supreme* power, as the Council of Trent calls it, because in the Church there is none more exalted, because all others depend upon it, being itself independent of all. It is an *ordinary* power, as it is called by the Fourth Lateran

\* Hergenrother's *Catholic Church and Christian State*. Essay iv., pt. 2., sec. 6.

Council, because the Pope, by the rights appertaining to him as head of the bishops, can perform ecclesiastical acts in any diocese. It is an *immediate* power, because it springs, not from the Church, not from the bishops, nor Councils, but from Christ Himself; and also because it can be exercised directly upon the faithful and their pastors. It does not abolish the direct power of the bishops, but supplements and compensates it, when interference is desirable for the good of the Church. The power of the Holy See is an *Episcopal* power, because its rights even over bishops are those of a bishop, and because the Pope is the bishop of bishops, the father of the fathers, the pastor of pastors. But, as St. Bernard teaches, and all theologians with him, this supreme Papal power is not the only power to be found in the Church. The Pope has no power to abolish the Episcopate; he cannot outstep the limits of Christ's appointment; and all the earlier definitions of the Church are binding upon him. The Vatican Council plainly declares that the supreme authority of the Holy See is not opposed to the authority of the bishops; bishops have by the Holy Spirit been constituted successors of the Apostles, and endowed with ordinary and immediate powers.”\*

With these definitions of the Papal power clearly before us, let us come to the words and the acts of St. Gregory.

(1.) The occasion of his using the denunciation in question. He is writing to the Emperor Maurice,† on occasion of John, Patriarch of Constantinople, having presumed on his position, under the shadow of the Imperial throne, to style himself “Universal Bishop.” So that we may remark at the outset, all that St. Gregory writes is in consequence of a claim set up by a rival. And he begins by asserting his own privileges, as having had the care and principedom of the whole Church committed to him. “It is evident,” he says, “to all who know the Gospel, that the care of the whole Church was committed, by the voice of the Lord, to the holy Apostle Peter, Prince of all the Apostles.” Could St. Gregory have asserted more strongly the Papal supremacy? For all the voice of antiquity, as well as the verdict of good sense, proclaims, that what was given to St. Peter was

\* *Ibid*, iv., pt. 2, sec. 6.

† Ep. lib. v. xx. 2.



given to his successors. The Good Shepherd was consulting for His whole flock, throughout all time and place ; and St. Peter's gifts were not a personal ornament, but an official and perpetual charge. In the words of St. Leo, " Simon dies, but Peter lives ; " lives on in office, authority, and power, by virtue of Him who said : " Behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world."

St. Gregory goes on to prove his point. " For to him it is said : ' Peter, lovest thou Me ? Feed My sheep.' " We may refer, in passing to the interpretation of this passage by the Fathers, who, as with one voice, declare that the whole flock is committed to Peter ; the body of the faithful, under the title, *lambs*, the teachers themselves, whether bishops or patriarchs, under that of *sheep*. " To him," proceeds St. Gregory, " it is said : ' Behold, Satan hath desired to have *you* [plural], that he may sift you as wheat ; but I have prayed for *thee*, that thy faith fail not : and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren.' " To him it is said : " Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build My Church : "—with the remainder of the passage. " Behold, he hath received the keys of the kingdom of Heaven ; the power of binding and loosing is given to him ; and yet he is not called Universal Apostle : whereas, that most holy man, my fellow-priest, John (we may take this, not as irony, but as real humility on the part of St. Gregory, who, like a Moses of the new covenant, was the meekest of men) strives after the title of Universal Bishop."

He goes on to speak of this claim as the act of a priest *seeking the vanity or emptiness of a name, glorying in new and profane words*. And the following is very significant. He shows that not only heretics but heresiarchs, inventors and leaders of heresy, had sat in the Patriarchal Chair of Constantinople ; and argues, that if they had been " Universal Bishops," the whole Church would have fallen with them. " But," he says, " be that name of blasphemy far from Christian hearts ; [a name] by which *all priests* are deprived of their honour, while it is insanely arrogated to himself by one."

Here is the key to all St. Gregory says on the subject. Any one who should take to himself the name of " Universal Bishop," in such sense as to deny that his brethren

were also true bishops within their spheres, would be guilty of arrogance and blasphemy. He would sin, for a double reason ; for first, his arrogant title would, by implication, destroy the episcopate of other bishops, and the apostolate of other Apostles—that is, he would be striving to abolish the direct work of God in the constitution of His Church ; secondly, in the words of St. Paul : “ No man taketh the honour to himself, but *he that is called by God*, as Aaron was ; ” a principle which finds its highest expression in Our Divine Lord Himself : “ Christ also did not glorify Himself to be made a high priest ; but He that said to Him : Thou art My Son ; this day have I begotten Thee.”\* But, if Our Lord, the Rock of ages, made Cephas the rock, and called him by the name that signified it ; if He, the Good Shepherd, gave him charge to feed all His flock, both sheep and lambs ; if “ the Holy One and the True One, who hath the key of David ; He that openeth and no man shutteth, shutteth and no man openeth ”†—if He has given to Peter the keys of the kingdom of Heaven, to bind and to loose, so that his sentence below shall be ratified above ; if the other Apostles, Peter’s brethren, and much more other bishops, were to be confirmed by him under the assaults of Satan, the spirit of error ; if these high gifts and solemn charges were given, not for a poor half century of time, till that martyred servant went to his Master’s reward, but “ all days, even to the consummation of the world ”—then, mark the consequence. Then is the Pope what all antiquity proclaims him ; then “ the power of the Holy See is an Episcopal power, because its rights even over bishops are those of a bishop, and because the Pope is the bishop of bishops, the father of the fathers, the pastor of pastors.”‡

It has been to save time that I have thus commented on St. Gregory’s words as we went on, instead of returning upon them. His next sentence is very important. He is still arguing against the Patriarch of Constantinople ; and his argument is *a fortiori*, as though he said : If my predecessors and I have never consented to use this title, we, successors of St. Peter in all his pre-eminence and power,

\* Heb. v. 4.    † Apoc. iii. 7.    ‡ Hergenröther, *ut supra*.

how much less ought the successor of heretics and heresiarchs to arrogate it to himself? "True it is," these are his words, following the previous quotation, "that out of honour to blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, *the name was offered* to the Roman Pontiff by the Venerable Council of Chalcedon.\* But none of them ever consented to use this name implying singularity or oneness (*hoc singularitatis nomine uti*)—to be called the universal or only bishop." Why? He adds the reason: "Lest, while something were given to one, as specially his, the whole body of priests should be deprived of the honour which is their due."

What can be clearer? To call oneself the only bishop on earth is to unbishop all the rest. The Pope has many singular and special titles, which can be attributed to none other; but no one of them implies that the bishops, his subjects, who derive from him both orders and jurisdiction, and in whose dioceses he can exercise episcopal functions, are not, all the while, true bishops, each in his own sphere. "How is it, then," he concludes, keeping still to his text, which has elicited the whole letter; "that while we seek not to be glorified by this term, even when it is offered to us, another presumes to seize on it for himself, even when it is not offered to him?"†

Let me illustrate this by a parallel case. It is a pious and reverential custom, and one the Church sanctions by an Indulgence attached to it, on greeting a Catholic bishop, to kiss the ring which he wears in token of his spiritual union with his diocese. Yet one has known bishops seem to decline this when offered; from a motive of humility, and from that dislike of outward demonstration which is part of our national character. On the other hand, it may well be believed that some few, at least, of the Protestant bishops, in these days of Disestablishment, would be anything but averse to such a recognition of the office which they believe themselves to possess. Now,

\* Let us not forget, that St. Gregory in another place, [Ep. xxv.] and writing to the said John of Constantinople, speaks of the first four General Councils as being a kind of Four Gospels, to which the most unhesitating submission is to be paid. If, then, we were to rest on the fact alone, mentioned in the text, it would be sufficient to confute the theory to which Dr. Fraser has committed himself.

† Epist. ad Maur. Imperat. lib. v. Ep. xx.

if I may take liberties with names, to illustrate the point, let us further suppose the Protestant bishop of Manchester to begin to wear an episcopal ring, and to express his opinion that some such ceremony of reverence ought to be done to it. It would be obvious to say: "Well, now, here is the Bishop of Salford, with his episcopal character acknowledged even by theological opponents, puts aside the outward homage when offered to him; and here is the Bishop of Manchester, whose orders no Catholic believes in for a moment, is wearing a ring and claiming the homage."

And so in our present case. Here is John of Constantino-  
nople, at the court of the Eastern Emperor, holding strong views of Church and State; thinks that, as the wren mounted on the eagle's back, he can soar aloft and be monarch of all he surveys. Nothing will serve him but to be bishop wherever Cæsar, his master, is king. And here is Gregory, invested, not by the descendant of Constantine, but by the Son of God, with all, and more than all, the proud Oriental can claim. We see him waiving the title, though he was conscious of the power it implied, and used it on occasion; putting the name aside, even when offered to him by a General Council, out of deference to his brethren the bishops, lest he should seem to depreciate the Sacrament of Order that was in them. Penetrated with the words of his Divine Master: "Whosoever will be first among you, shall be the servant of all," he delights in that title, which every Pope since his day has adopted after his example—*Servus servorum Dei*. If I may make a comparison without irreverence, and within due degrees, I seem to see here even such a contrast as I will name. It is between Lucifer in heaven, whose word was: "*Non serviam*, I will not serve; *Ascendam in thronum Dei*, I will mount up into the throne of God; *Similis ero Altissimo*, I will be like the Most High: and who lost his heaven for his pride; and, on the other hand, the ever blessed maiden of Nazareth, chief of all God's creation, the praying omnipotence, who could obtain everything by a word; yet whose one title for herself was this: *Ancilla Domini*,—the handmaid of the Lord.

All this while, we have not come to the passage about Antichrist and his forerunner. Here it is; from a later

Epistle of St. Gregory to the same Emperor. Maurice had treated the title claimed by the Patriarch of Constantinople as very much a title of honour, and the question with Rome as very much a matter of words. An incidental argument, that he acknowledged the real thing to be with St. Gregory, and felt that to indulge his patriarch's desire would not abate what belonged to the Holy See. He had accordingly moved St. Gregory not to let what he called "a frivolous appellation" make a breach between East and West. To this the Saint answers:

"I beseech your imperial clemency to consider, that some things frivolous are very harmless, and others extremely pernicious. When Antichrist shall come, and assert that he is God, will it not be very frivolous, and yet exceedingly pernicious? If we look to the amount of his utterance, it is two syllables (*Deum*); if we regard the weight of the iniquity, it is the destruction of all. Now, I confidently assert that whosoever shall call himself, or desire to be called, Universal Priest (*universalem sacerdotem*) is in that self-exaltation a forerunner of Antichrist, because, puffed up with pride, he places himself before others. And it is by a pride equal (to the other's) that he is led into the error. For, as that perverse one (Antichrist) desires to be held as God, and exalted above all men, so, whoever he be who desires to be called the only priest (*solus sacerdos*) is setting himself above all other priests. But, whereas the Truth says: Every one who exalteth himself shall be humbled, I know that every self-exaltation bursts the more quickly, the more it is puffed up." He adds, with the unfeigned personal humility which is the interpretation of the whole, "I, sinner, who hold [the principle of] lowliness on the authority of God Himself, am not to be exhorted to be lowly."\*

(II.) I think, then, we have seen the sense in which St. Gregory wrote, in these epistles. He waived nothing of the authority entrusted to him; for he desired to acquit himself as a faithful steward. He waived, in his own case, what would have been merely a title of honour, and might have been construed to the depreciation or denial of the priesthood of his brethren. He steadfastly refused to

\* Epist. ad Maur. Imperat. lib. vii. Ep. xxxiii (al. xix).

acknowledge, in another and a subordinate, what belonged, by divine appointment, to the Chair in which he had himself been placed. He certainly did not consider himself to be a successor of Antichrist, because his predecessors, Clement, Victor, Vigilius, Innocent, and so many others, had acted on the authority they received over the whole Church, and that in the most pronounced and unmistakable way. He was not exalting himself; far be it from him: he would not have been conformed to the teaching of his Master. But the charge that Master laid upon him was another thing, and the pre-eminence it implied. He was, in a real sense, what he disclaimed in another sense. He was set over the whole Church, and could not help it. He was able to depose John of Constantinople by a stroke of his pen, by a word of his mouth. He was all that St. Clement was, all that St. Victor was, all that St. Innocent was, and he knew it as perfectly as they did. What he disclaimed, he disclaimed in the sense in which Pius IX. did so at the Vatican Council. He disclaimed it, when it was a symptom of pride, a self-assertion, an arrogance against a constituted Divine authority. Had he been Patriarch of Constantinople, he would have been the last to revolt against the Holy See, and the foremost to assert its authority.

(III.) For we come to this further point: Did he refuse the authority as well as the title? By no manner of means. What he did actually assert for himself we learn both from his words and his acts. Let us take the following: (a.) His decision regarding the case of the bishop of Milan. This bishop had appealed to the Holy See, bringing charges against a neighbouring bishop, named Pompeius; and St. Gregory complained that the charges had not been sufficiently sifted, nor accurately stated; and thus concludes: "We cannot, nor ought we, to decide anything rashly concerning the person of a bishop; lest we be found blameable, which God forbid, in our own judgments; we, to whom of right it belongs to reconsider, or annul [*retractare*] the judgments of others."\*

(b.) See, again, what he writes, on giving the pallium to the Bishop of Palermo, in Sicily. "But this we ad-

\* Ep. lib. x., xxix.

monish, that the reverence due to the Apostolic See be troubled by the presumption of no man. For then does the condition of the limbs remain healthful and sound, if no injury shall strike *the head of the faith*.”\*

(c.) He sends an epistle to the Bishop of Syracuse, regarding the Primate of Bisacium, in Africa, a see which lay within the the patriarchate of Alexandria. This Primate had been accused of some fault, and the Emperor had desired that his cause should be judged by the Holy See. Why, but that the Pope is bishop of bishops? St. Gregory writes to the Bishop of Syracuse, doubting the sincerity of the accused Primate's professions of subjection to the Holy See; yet speaks of it as a profession quite obvious and needless to make: for, he says, “if any fault, or matter of blame, is found, I know not what bishop is not subject to this [See]:—*Nescio quis ei episcopus subjectus non sit.*†

(d.) He pronounces a certain priest, named Athanasius, innocent of the heresy of which he had been accused. Athanasius had appealed to the Holy See from his own Patriarch of Constantinople, and St. Gregory had sent letters to the Patriarch, to be informed of the circumstances: and he thus concludes his epistle to the priest: “We give thee free liberty to return, nevertheless, to thy monastery, in thy own place or order:”‡—nevertheless; that is, notwithstanding the accusation, which had not been retracted at Constantinople.

Now, what do we learn from these facts?

Why, either St. Gregory is bishop of bishops, and primate supreme among patriarchs, or how will you free him from being ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος, an intruder into another man's diocese? *Medium, si quis possit, inveniat.* This humble man, who seems, as the prophet Jeremias, when sent to reprove rebellious Israel, to reply to the Lord, and say: “Ah, ah, ah, Lord God; behold, I cannot speak, for I am a child,” seems also to receive for answer, as did Jeremias: “Say not, I am a child: for thou shalt go to all that I shall send thee, and whatsoever I shall command

\* Ep. lib. xiii., xxxvii. † Ep. lib. ix., lix. ‡ Ep. lib. vi., lxvi.

thee, thou shalt speak. Lo, I have set thee this day over the nations, and over kingdoms; to root up, and to pull down, and to waste, and to destroy, and to build, and to plant. Thou, therefore, gird up thy loins, and arise, and speak to them all that I command thee. Be not afraid at their presence; for I will make thee not to fear their countenance. For, behold, I have made thee this day a fortified city, and a pillar of iron, and a wall of brass, over all the land, to the kings of Juda, to the princes thereof, and to the priests, and to the people of the land.”\*

(IV.) We come now to the fourth question: Did Popes before St. Gregory, and writers of the Church before and after, attribute both thing and title, or the thing with equivalent titles, to the Holy See?

(a) We need hardly go back to St. Clement, whom we have seen asserting his authority as bishop of the bishop of Corinth, while he felt the responsibility of the charge to which it pledged him. It may here be repeated, that as Corinth did not belong to the Western Patriarchate, it could only be under St. Clement's jurisdiction as Pope of the universal Church; which is bishop of bishops, if anything.

(b) St. Victor, at the end of the second century, was prepared to excommunicate the bishops of Asia Minor, with their whole flocks, because they maintained against the Holy See their own method of celebrating Easter; though they might plead an usage derived apparently from St. John. On Protestant or Anglican principles, what a ludicrous act on the part of the Pope? They might have replied: We are of the East, you are of the West. Hold to your own position: Exercise authority over the bishops immediately around you: Do not presume *ἀλλοτριεπισκοπεῖν*, to adjudicate in another man's diocese. Yet, what was the case? The excommunication was simply abandoned at the instance of those who came about the Pope with the petition to do so. And when they, and chiefly St. Irenæus, interceded for the East, it was not with a denial of St. Victor's authority or jurisdiction, but with a mere appeal to his clemency. Some writers have blamed the Pope's severity in this. We are not here concerned to answer; though grave reasons may be alleged for the line he took. The simple point is, that

\* Jeremias, i., 6-18.



he had the power, and was therefore bishop of the bishops of Asia. On this subject of the celebration of Easter, I will add, that St. Polycarp had, before this, come all the way from his diocese of Smyrna to the Pope of his day, in order to the settlement of the question. Why come to Rome? why not be satisfied with the apostolical custom they are said to have followed? Why? Because even when Apostles, and their descendents, were sifted as wheat, Peter, and his successors, had to confirm his brethren.

(c) We have the same assertion of authority in the writings of Pope St. Innocent I., in the fifth century. "Let us therefore begin," he says, "with help of the holy Apostle, Peter, through whom both the apostleship and the episcopate took their rise in Christ. These, then, are the things which it behoves every Catholic bishop, having before his eyes the judgment of God, henceforward to observe, that if any causes, or contentions, arise between clergy of the higher, or even of an inferior, order, the dispute be settled, agreeably to the synod of Nicæa, by an assembly of the bishops of that same province; and that it be not lawful for any one (without prejudice, however, to the Roman Church, to which in all causes reverence ought to be preserved), to leave those priests, who by the will of God, govern the church of God, and to have recourse to other provinces. If *any greater causes* [of faith and discipline] shall have been brought forward (or, discussed), let them, after the judgment of the bishop, be reported (or, referred) to the Apostolic See, as the synod resolved, and a blessed custom requires."\*

As to the Popes who lived after St Gregory, we have in them one consistent stream of testimony, to quote which in detail would be impossible.

(d) Once more, Pope Vigilius, coming now nearer to St. Gregory's own day,† is urged by the Empress Theodora, the haughty wife of Justinian, to restore Anthemius, patriarch of Constantinople, and to depose Mennas, who held the see. What should make the imperial power send all the way to Rome, and even (for Emperors *will* do such things) bring Vigilius by force, to bend him to its will, unless he was con-

\* Ep. ii., Galland, t. viii.

† The date of his Pontificate is 537-556.

fessedly the only man who could do what they desired? They felt, imperious as they were, that any Patriarch not of the Pope's appointment, would be a schismatic. Then, matters being adjusted, Vigilius ratifies the fifth General Council, held at Constantinople, (553), and, during its session, erects the patriarchate of Jerusalem, to the depression of the metropolitan See of Cæsarea. Significant facts, on every side, which are not touched by the circumstances of Vigilius' election. Suppose him even an anti-pope, which he ceased to be, at all events, on the death of his predecessor, St. Silverius. Yet, all the while, he is none the less—indeed, all the more—a witness to the power of a Pope legitimate and true.

(e) We will now have an opponent or two; no less valuable testimony, often, than that of supporters and advocates. It is profitable to draw a truth from the lips of an adversary; as we have been doing from Dr. Fraser.

Let us take the witness of Tertullian, after he had fallen into the heresy of Montanus. The rancour of his writings against the Church, for her lenient treatment of penitent sinners, is well known. Here is one of his sarcasms: "I hear that an edict is set forth, and a peremptory one indeed; to wit, the chief pontiff, that is, the bishop of bishops, proclaims"—and so he goes on, rehearsing what the Pope had in fact proclaimed; the absolution of grievous sinners who had performed the penance enjoined on them. His object is to discredit the title he names, or any idea that could lead to it; but of what use to discredit these, if the idea did not exist, and the title had never been attributed? It would have been, not sarcastic merely, but senseless. Take a parallel case. The newspapers hardly ever mention Rome without a Tertullian-like hit at the Infallibility of the Holy Father. Some lively "special correspondent," during the recess of parliament, or when murders and railway accidents are unequal to the demand, discharges his small revolver at the Holy See. The Campagna, he tells us, though under the dominion (when it was so) of an infallible monarch, might be greatly improved by a little Scotch farming. Pio Nono, the Infallible, has never mastered the theory of finance, or the balance of European power, or the action of the Teutonic mind. His infalli-

bility never suggested to him the draining of the Tiber. What would all these things mean—ludicrous and ignorant as they are, if no worse—what even apparent sense would there be in them, if the title Infallible had never been given? Tertullian was too vigorous a writer to waste words on what would find no response in the intelligence of his hearers. His sarcasm was to be a stroke: but an effective stroke presupposes a place to hit. He meant to discredit a title, not by inventing or suggesting, but by rehearsing it; and, if he called the Pope the bishop of bishops in a hostile sense, be sure that others had done it before him with earnest belief.

A great student of Tertullian was St. Cyprian. He might have chosen a better master: and it was this influence, perhaps, as well as his difference with Pope St. Stephen, that made the Synod of Carthage, over which he presided, say, in words probably aimed at Stephen: "Nor does any one of us set himself up as bishop of bishops, or force his colleagues, by despotic terrorism, to compulsory obedience."

We may appeal from Cyprian the warm assertor of his own views to St. Cyprian, chastened by suffering, a witness to Catholic unity, and a martyr for the faith.\* He is here quoted, with Tertullian, for the same reason. Both were witnesses, unconscious perhaps and involuntary, that the title which, from their own point of view, they impugned, existed, nevertheless, and was acknowledged by the faithful. As to St. Cyprian, in his calmer and worthier moods, we are left in no doubt as to his opinions. Besides the plain conclusion to be drawn from his whole treatise on the Unity of the Church, take this one passage. Writing to Pope St. Cornelius, he complains that the schismatical followers of Felicissimus, "having had a pseudo-bishop set up for themselves by heretics, dare to sail, and to carry letters, from men schismatic and profane, to the chair of Peter, and to the *principal Church, whence the unity of the priesthood took its rise*: nor do they consider, that the

\* "*Si quid in eo [Cypriano] fuerat emendandum, purgavit Pater falce passionis*:" so speaks St. Augustine as to St. Cyprian's errors on the subject of rebaptising. (Ad Vincentium, xciii. Ad Macrobinum cviii. ed. Bened.) The same may be applied to this case.

Romans are they whose faith was praised in the preaching of the Apostle, [and] to whom faithlessness [treachery to the faith] cannot have access."\* We need no more than such words as these, to show both the orthodoxy of St. Cyprian (who has sometimes been claimed by the heterodox, with much rejoicing) and the established fact of appeals to Rome in his day, as to the ultimate reference for questions on doctrine and discipline. Why should he, or why should the adherents of this schismatic bishop of Carthage, go to "the Chair of Peter," unless both he and they had interpreted the Divine command, "Confirm thy brethren," as all Catholic Christendom interprets it to day?

(f) As to the Fathers in general, their witness is unanimous; this has been shown again and again by writers who have devoted themselves to the proof.† We will be satisfied with one, because of his antiquity, and nearness to the Apostles: St. Irenæus.

It seems a special Providence, that St. Irenæus, whose opportunities of learning "the truth as it is in Jesus" from those whom our Lord commissioned to declare it, were all but unequalled, should have been guided to write as he writes, regarding two principal Catholic doctrines. None can question the antiquity, nor the trustworthiness, of what he delivers. The disciple of Polycarp has handed down to us the "good deposit of faith" as to the privileges and glories of the ever-blessed Mother of God, and as to the Papal power, in a way that leaves nothing to desire. St. Bernard, for example, "the last of the Fathers," has hardly anything in his Papal treatise "*De Consideratione*" which is not a simple expansion of what I am going to quote. Nor has he, nor St. Alphonsus, those great clients of Mary, gone beyond the one sentence of St. Irenæus, which I have already given from—strange assortment of names!—John Milton.

St. Irenæus, then, speaks as follows. They are well known words; and those who do not like them have been

\* Cypr. Ep. ad Cornel. lv.

† See especially (as among the most accessible) Hergenröther, whose work is quoted above, and the authorities given by him, *passim*. Also, Waterworth's *Faith of Catholics*, vol. ii. pp. 62-109.

almost as ingenious in interpretation as they have concerning "Thou art Peter."

He speaks of "the greatest, and most ancient, and universally known church, founded and constituted at Rome, by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul," and of "that faith announced to *all men*, which through the successors of [her] bishops has come down to us." He then goes on to say, still more explicitly: "To this Church, on account of its more powerful principality, it is necessary that every church, that is, the faithful on every side, should resort"—[or agree with it, *convenire, συβιβειν*]—"in which [Church] always, by those who are on every side, has been preserved that tradition which is from the Apostles."\*

The sentences are drawn up with almost a lawyer's precision. What do they contain, but the following assertions?

(1.) The Church of Rome was the greatest of Churches: greater, therefore, than Antioch, St. Peter's first See: greater than Alexandria, that of his disciple St. Mark: greater even than the holy City Jerusalem, where was the chair of St. James the Just.

(2.) It was the most ancient: an accidental, yet pre-eminent glory.

(3.) It had a more powerful principality than any other.†

(4.) This principality was a real dominion over the rest; for

(5.) An appeal lay to the Church of Rome from all the faithful of the Catholic world: they must of necessity† resort to and agree with it.

\* Adv. Hæres. lib. iii, c. 3, n. 2, p. 176.

† See a useful note on the *propter potentioorem principalem* in the Latin version (the only one we possess) of St. Irenæus' words, given in Waterworth's *Faith of Catholics*, vol. ii. p. 3.

† *Necesse est*: not by any temporal compulsion or motive, which was entirely absent in the struggling infancy and persecution of the whole Church; but by the divine appointment, which had centred there the unity of the whole, and the perpetual, indefectible purity of the tradition of truth.

(6.) In this Church, the tradition of the Apostles, *i.e.*, the truth of their Divine Lord, had always been preserved.\*

(7.) And preserved there, as in a treasure-house, for the use of "the faithful on every side;" and proved, amongst other proofs, by their concurrence in seeking it.

We need no more. The words stand as an ancient landmark; and no man is blessed who would remove it. They point, like a steadfast finger-post, to the "City set on a hill, which cannot be hid," which he must be blind who will not recognize. No man is blessed who would take down that finger-post; who would obliterate or alter its witness.

So we pass from our second topic. We leave St. Gregory, precisely where we found him: a very Papal pope; and one whose personal humility never weakened (how should it?) his strenuous denunciation of a rival claim, nor his acknowledged exercise of that universal authority which our Lord had centred in His Vicar.

\* And therefore St. Victor, in preparing to excommunicate the Churches of Asia, in the days of St. Irenæus himself, was not acting against the tradition of truth.

## III.

## A NATIONAL, CATHOLIC, PROTESTANT CHURCH.

Leaving the *terra firma* of history and documents, Dr. Fraser now transports us into Dreamland. He dreams a dream; and he preaches it. St. Clement and St. Gregory are, at best, intractable materials. In dealing with them, he has first boldly asserted the untenable, then fallen into the groove and tradition of an old-world outworn misinterpretation. He must feel that to be unsatisfactory in a high degree, and much to be regretted. But Dreamland is a land of liberty, untrammelled by facts; those stubborn things. Every man has a right to dream; else, what would become of ecclesiastical writers of fiction? Let us examine this particular dream, and see if it is susceptible of any reasonable interpretation.

"One dreamed dreams, sometimes—though he did not suppose they would be realised in his time"—come, that is a lucid interval—"that we might have in England a National, Catholic, and Protestant Church, standing upon the old historic foundations of Christianity; accepting all the great principles of the Reformation, and holding fast to the faith which had been the heritage of the Church of Christ for fifteen centuries before the Reformation was heard of. If there could be a great National, Catholic, and Protestant Church, such as that, in which men would be rational, moderate, conciliating, and patient, that, he believed, would be the surest and only effectual bulwark"—good news, this, at least—"against the great arrogant Church of Rome."

Where shall we begin, in our analysis? Horace must have had nightmares of this sort in his mind;

Where, like a sick man's dream, nor head nor foot  
To any known consistent shape belongs.\*

\* *Velut ægri somnia vanæ*

*Finguntur species, ut nec pes nec caput uni  
Reddatur formæ.*

*Hor. De Arte Poetica.*

Is the speaker serious? or is he playing with words? If serious, he means something like the following propositions:—(1.) A National Church can be Catholic. (2.) A Catholic Church can be Protestant. (3.) A Protestant Church can stand on the old historic foundations of Christianity. (4.) The principles of the Reformation were the principles of the previous fifteen hundred years. (5.) This Church of his dream, a Church of threefold contradiction, will be the means of upholding the creeds: those creeds which, in every part of the world where his principles prevail—Protestant Germany, the dis-established Church of Ireland, or the Episcopal Church of America—are in process of being disintegrated or abandoned. (6.) This Church of incongruous elements, this house divided against itself, this baseless fabric, would be an effectual bulwark, he thinks, against a Church the compact unity of which is acknowledged, even by its enemies, with hatred and fear; a Church that has stood, like the serried square of infantry at Quatre-Bras, that we have all lately admired,\* and stood against the assaults of heavier cuirassiers than Dr. Fraser; a Church that “knows what it means, and means what it says;” and which, as “a stone cut out of the mountain without hands”—for Nabuchodonosor’s dream shall interpret this other—needs but to come into fair collision with the feet and toes of such a statue, part of iron and part of clay, to “break it in pieces, and make it as the chaff of a summer threshing-floor.”†

Such is the mass of absurdities and misuse of primary terms, which we trace, as inevitable conclusions, in his few sentences. It is as if one should say:—(1.) France is Europe. (2.) England is France. (3.) Cromwell derived his authority from Charlemagne. (4.) The principles of the Reformed Parliament were introduced by William the Conqueror. (5.) Bring Free Trade into a country, and you will be carrying out the Continental system. (6.) The only effectual way to prevent the sun entering Capricorn, would be for everybody to sign the Thirty-nine Articles.

With every desire to treat the subject gravely, how can

\* The well-known and striking picture on this subject, lately exhibited in Manchester.

† Dan. ii. 34, 35.



one combat absurdity, except by showing it to be absurd? How could one adequately display the illogical assumptions, and sheer begging of the question, which characterise Dr. Fraser's utterances, but by translating them into a parallel subject-matter more familiar, perhaps, to your thoughts?

On this point, indeed, of begging the question, we must employ a moment or two. It will not be time thrown away. There is no commoner form of argument than this, of simply begging the question. It is said to be (whether or no) a peculiarly feminine mode of reasoning. It was adopted, however, by that unfeminine person, Queen Elizabeth. If you look through the royal edicts, at the time when she was employed in transmuting one religion into another, by the gentle persuasion of rack and halter, you will find it employed in right royal style; and so it has passed from the head of the Protestant Church into its members. It has largely infected the clergy in their assertions, whether peaceful or polemical. Dr. Fraser has caught rather a severe touch of it. Let us hope it will not become chronic. He ought to despise anything so unworthy of a man of position, or a reasoner. Would you have this mode of argument described? What, then, is begging the question?

It is simply taking for granted the thing you have to prove: passing it over, as a something no one ought to demur about; deciding grandly, and as if from a height;

*Sic volo, sic jubeo : stet pro ratione voluntas.*

It is, because it is ;

And it is, because I say so ;

And I say so, because I wish it to be so :

Therefore it is.

I diverge for a moment from Dr. Fraser, to give a magnificent specimen exhibited at a "Church Defence" meeting in Preston, the other day. One speaker, an extensive mendicant of the question, delivered himself as follows: "People generally believed that the Church of England began at the Reformation. It did no such thing: it was founded in apostolical times, and it was now the same Church as it was in the beginning, purified from errors imported into it by the Church of Rome. At that time, there was no transfer of property, as was the common

idea. No property was taken from the Church of Rome, and the same bishops remained in their sees. The Church of England was endowed by her own children." In these few sentences, which run on so smoothly, and elicited, of course, applause from the Church Defenders at Preston, there are no less than nine unmitigated assumptions, and (speaking in a merely historical sense) falsehoods. Nine times is the question magnificently begged, in as many brief clauses. Positive talent is shown, in packing so many within so limited a space. "It is so, because it is so: or, it is so, because I say it." This meets us in more commonplace forms, at every turn. And so we come back to Dr. Fraser.

You remember how he begged the case about St. Clement, and was put to no slight confusion—if one may judge from what would have been one's own feelings—by a casual inspection of that Saint's writings. So about St. Gregory. So here. We will allow him his dream for a moment; this monster night-mare, of so many heads and so many eyes, which I might expect to find with Cerberus and the hydra. Here is one of its heads; and it cannot open its mouth without begging the question. A Church, he says, may accept all the great principles of the Reformation, yet hold fast to the faith of the fifteen centuries before. That is, you may hold to what we have heard from St. Clement, about confession, and yet accept a prayer-book which treats confession as an optional and exceptional case. You may hold to the faith which teaches to reserve and to adore the elements, and yet accept the Anglican practice, which sternly, and of set purpose,\* forbids their being reserved, adored, or supposed to be adorable. You may hold, with St. Irenæus, that every Church, and the faithful throughout the world, must needs, as a first obligation, have recourse to, and agreement with, the Church of Rome; and yet, with Henry VIII. and his daughter, and the Church they founded, you may cast off, disown, vilify, and revolt from the Church of Rome, and put her children to a cruel martyrdom.

\* There are few points on which the established religion speaks with less stammering lips, or more completely knows its own mind. See the rubrics in the Service of the Communion of the Sick, as well as at the end of the Communion Service.

So we might go on: but really the topics, and the absurdities, accumulate upon us. Tell me that a Catholic Church can be a Protestant Church, or *vice versa*; you commit yourself to conclusions like the following. We will put them historically, and therefore in the past tense. (1) They who owned the Pope were one with those who disowned the Pope. (2) They who were united with Christendom, were one with those who severed themselves, and stood apart. (3) They who adored our Lord in the Sacrament of His love, were one with those who denounced the act as idolatry. (4) They who taught and offered the august Sacrifice of the Christian law, were one with those, who by their Articles were pledged to call its celebrations "blasphemous figments and pernicious impostures." (5) They who, from earliest antiquity, prayed for the dead, were one with those who built up, as it were, a wall between dead and living, and ignored all help they could bring them. (6) They who forbade a priest to marry, because he was united with the mystical Spouse, the Church, were one with those who, having blotted out all true notion of the supernatural, and of the sacrificial priest, saw no difficulty in a married clergy. Let any one tell you all these absurdities, possessed as you now are, by this mere juxtaposition of details, penetrated, as you are, with the essential, radical differences between these point-blank antagonisms in the very theory of Christianity; what would you answer? You might reasonably answer, that your informant was insulting your common understandings. Yet so much, I am compelled to say, does Dr. Fraser; in all simplicity, doubtless, and all good faith. He tells you of his Church of the future, that is to combine these jarring elements. May you all be preserved from so heavy a misfortune as belonging to it!

Probably, by this time, we are agreed on a truth so plain that one might well be sorry to spend words upon it. A Catholic Church is not a Protestant Church. Black is not white, nor grey. You must make your election between them, for you cannot have both. You may, indeed, misuse and distort plain terms, as the right rev. preacher seems to do; and by "Catholic" you may mean what pagan Rome meant, when, in the words of St. Leo, "she imagined she had received, and included, a great amount of religious

truth, because she rejected no falsehood." You may take the Catholic temper of mind to mean, an uncaring, semi-infidel universalism of non-belief; the temper of Gallio; "agreeing to differ;" or, as it is said of an Anglican dignitary in London, "loving everything in general, and believing nothing in particular." In this view, the note of the Church would be, not that she is One, or Holy, or Apostolic, but that she is all-including, none-rejecting. This is certainly Protestantism to the heart's core; it comes to Horne Tooke's definition, or derivation: "Truth is that which each one troweth." But, no. The Church is not a mere "happy family," to hold all kinds of incongruous denizens in one cage. Among the first conditions of her existence is this:—a divinely appointed power of expulsion. Every healthy body expels morbid humours, that would fester into disease. And the Church is the mystical Body of Christ. They who diverge from her doctrine and practice, must needs depart. Remain in unity, or cease to trouble those who do. And this, not for mere peace' sake, though peace is a precious thing; not "anything for a quiet life;" but because divine truth is in question. "The wisdom which is from above," says St. James, "first indeed is chaste, then peaceable."\* First, the purity of revelation, untampered with by man's theories, undistorted by man's traditions, unabridged by man's compromises and mutual concessions—for people are never so generous as when they are dealing with property that does not belong to them.

Here, then, we have an essential difference between the Catholic Church and all Protestant "variations." Catholicity is founded on revelation; Protestantism (I must needs speak it) on revolt; and then, a mutual adjustment and compromise among the revolvers. Catholicity is: "Hear the Church;" and, "if he hear not the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican." Protestantism is: "The Church was once worthy to be heard, but is not so to-day. We protest against her. The gates of hell have prevailed. The keys of the kingdom of heaven have become hampered, and we must pick the lock for ourselves. The Church is no longer 'the pillar and the ground of truth.' She has shaken and fallen down. Her voice has

\* S. James iii, 17.

become altered by age. Therefore, we will *not* hear the Church; but we will hear each other, or rather ourselves. Each man his own Pope; each man infallible, amid the clash of opinions and the tumult of dissonant voices. The Bible, and the Bible only: no, not quite only, for we must have our individual interpretations, by the right of private judgment." All this is Protestantism. And, meanwhile, above the roar of the waves, above the hoarse voices of tumultuous opposition and self-contradictory revolt, see what Dr. Fraser calls "the great arrogant Church of Rome," a rock amid the billows, calmly overlooking the quicksands on every side; see the mother of souls, gathering her two hundred millions of sons and daughters around her, teaching with untroubled, unfaltering, consistent voice, while ages glide by, and Judgment nears: teaching as St. Clement taught, as St. Peter taught, and St. Gregory, and two hundred and fifty Popes beside him; and as the last Pope will teach over-night, when the Church militant shall pass into the Church triumphant the next morning.

No; a Catholic Church cannot be Protestant, unless you are to distort simple terms, and abuse the Queen's English. They will amalgamate when oil mixes with water, or when red is blue, or when a figure is at once a circle and a square, or under any other absurd conditions one may please to suppose. Have I detained you too long on a truth so obvious? Perhaps: yet we were compelled to it by the strange misuse of language we have been considering.

(II.) But now, let us proceed to another point; not, perhaps, quite so plain at first sight, yet sufficiently evident when we consider it. *Can a National Church be Catholic?*

Here again, I answer, No: if we understand the terms. Not, certainly, in the sense of the speaker under review. He dreams of a Church, national, yet casting off the supreme central authority which St. Clement, St. Irenæus, and St. Gregory tell you resides in the See of Rome: a Church circumscribed within the four seas of Britain—word for word, almost, the language of Henry VIII. and his obsequious parliament, when they disowned the Chair of Peter. Such a Church cannot be Catholic, until general and particular come to mean the same. To be Catholic means, to be independent of national divisions or differences, to transcend them, to overflow them, to be concerned with

all the races and ages of mankind ; “ Catholic in time and place,” as our very catechism teaches. To be national means, to be co-extensive, at the best, with an empire or a state, or with the home of some special race, or the region of a language—some circumstance, marking off a section of men from their fellows on the habitable globe : in a word, to be, not universal, but specific. Am I not trifling with your attention ? Is it not plain, these two ideas are not merely distinct, but irreconcilable ?

Now, if there is one thing marked in the words of our Divine Lord, when speaking of His Church, it is her Catholic unity, her universality. How emphatic is His last prayer for those He was leaving orphans, and for the countless millions who should afterwards “ believe in Him through their word ! ” “ That they all may be one.” There is no thought of a nation here. He even carries up this principle of unity in the Church to the Divine eternal unity in the God of the Church, as to its type and origin. “ As Thou, Father, in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us.” And this unity of the Church below, a light reflected from the Unity of God above, as that of the moon from the sun, was to be the unmistakable proof of His divine mission, and therefore of hers : “ That the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me.” He repeats it again and again, as dwelling with love on the beauty of this created mirror of the Eternal Father and of Himself ; looking with Divine complacency on this work of His hands, and pronouncing it “ very good : ”—“ That they may be one, as We also are One : I in them, and Thou in Me : that they may be made perfect in one ; and that the world may know that Thou hast sent Me, and hast loved them, as Thou hast also loved Me.”\* Hear, again, St. Paul, speaking of the Church as one body, animated with one life ; each part and member of which has its own function, and co-operates with the whole ; a body in which there can be “ no schism ; ” from which, if any portion is cut off, it lies lifeless and corrupting, as an amputated limb ; a body of which Christ is the Head, nourishing and cherishing it, ruling and loving it.† He, too, like his Master, refers the

\* St. John, xvii., 20-23.

† 1 Cor. x. 17, xii. 12-27. Eph. i. 22, 23, iii. 6, iv. 12, 16, v. 23-32. Col. i. 18-24, ii. 19.

unity of the Church to the Unity of God: "One body, and one spirit, one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism."\* So, again, he speaks of the union of all races and all antecedents in One Church; her universality, her freedom from nationalism: "Where there is neither Gentile nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, nor Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ is all, and in all."† He reminds the Ephesians of their former alienation from God, when the Jews were the chosen people; that is, when religion and the Church were *national*. And he draws the contrast: "But now, in Christ Jesus, you, who sometimes were afar off, are made near by the Blood of Christ. For He is our peace, who hath made both one. . . breaking down the *middle wall of partition*, that he might make the two in Himself into one new man. . . Now, therefore, you are no more strangers and foreigners; but you are fellow-citizens with the Saints, and the domestics of God, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief Corner Stone, in whom all the building, framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord."‡

What symptom of nationalism, I ask, is found here? A National Church? The idea is gone; it has shrunk away, as something too small; a paltry contrivance of man, and of wicked men to boot, for their own special and evil ends: political, merely, in its best aspect; schismatical, soul-destroying, in essence and operation. "The bed is straitened, so that one must fall out."§ It is "a short covering," too short to cover any true notion of the length and breadth of God's Church. A National Church is not the Church of prophecy; "In the last days, the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be prepared on the tops of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills; and *all nations* shall flow unto it. And *many people* shall go, and say: 'Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord.'"<sup>¶</sup> A National Church is not the Church for which our Lord prayed, the night before He suffered. It is not the Church announced by His Apostles. It certainly is not the Church of the Apocalypse. The Church of the Bible is the universal family of Him who is All, and in all; the one body of

\* Eph. iv. 4, 5.      † Col. iii. 2.      ‡ Eph. ii. 13-21.

§ Is. xviii, 20.      ¶ Is. ii, 2, 3; Mich. iv, 1, 2.

the One Head: new-born in Baptism, fed and kept alive by Sacraments, taught from one chair, guided by one pastoral staff; converging on Cephas, the rock of strength, the centre of Catholic unity, the shepherd of the flock, the Vicar of Christ. Mountains and seas do not divide it. It is not this nation or race, this language, this character and mode of thought, more than the other, for which the Church provides. It is *man*, as man; nothing less, nothing narrower; man, descending from the first Adam, needing restoration by the second; it is the children of the East and the West, of the North and the South, when they come to sit down in the kingdom of God. There they are, side by side, in the great unity: Jew and Scythian; "Parthians and Medes, and Elamites;" the African and the Esquimaux; the Italian mind and the Teutonic mind; the primitive christian, the mediæval and the modern man. Any banner may float over his ships and fortresses; the lilies of an ancient monarchy, the crosses of an united empire, the tricolor of one republic, or the stars and stripes of another. What note does the universal Mother take of these minor and sectional differences among her children? What the philosopher claimed, as man, that she claims as the Church of men: *Nihil humanum a me alienum puto*. She takes no note of the colour of their skin; she does not criticise their mode of speech. They are children in her one family; she knows of their national distinctions, only to become "all things to all;" only to provide for them according to their especial needs.

Is it not wonderful that here in this corner of the world, intelligent men should be so shrunk, so dwarfed, should be so wedded and bound down to a theory thus narrow and exclusive, as to glory in their religious nationalism, as though it were not a calamity and a reproach? Isolated we were of old, in our island home: that separation has been bridged over by modern science, and the inter-communication of mankind. But insular we became, in a more fatal sense, when a king, whom I abstain from portraying, offered his subjects the choice, to break from the head of Christendom, or lose their own. It was the mere act of a despot, unwillingly submitted to by such of his subjects as had not the fortitude to suffer martyrdom for Catholic unity. But by what blindness to the first principles of



God's kingdom, do men now delight to record themselves as "strangers and foreigners?" How is it, they will to disown all fellow-citizenship with the Saints, and build on another foundation than the Corner-stone? Having been made near by the Blood of Christ, why will they retreat again afar off, and, as though it were their national privilege, remain there, isolated and apart? Is not this what the Apostle calls, glorying in their disgrace? It is, at least, priding themselves on their deep misfortune. And let me now point one essential characteristic of a National Church, which should open anyone's eyes who has read the foregoing passages from Scripture.

A National Church, then, has a head; because every ecclesiastical system pre-supposes subordination, running up to a supreme authority. That head is the State. I will be "fearless" in my turn, and assert this fearlessly. A sectional Church, indeed, one not even national, may be merely contemptible, as to numbers and influence, like the Episcopal body in Scotland, or in America, or the lingering remnant of Jansenists in Holland, or these "Old Catholics," as they style themselves, who are going to pieces, or turning into a kind of New Lutherans before our eyes. These, indeed, have no head, because they are mere unrecognised sects within the limits of a nation. But an ecclesiastical body that can lay any claim to be national, like the English Establishment or the Russian Schism, leans perforce on the secular power as its ultimate referee and centre of repose. Elizabeth boasted that she could "tune the pulpits" of her bishops. "Proud prelate!" she said to one of them, when he showed just a spark of independence: "I made you, and I can unmake you.\*" This was no empty boast: it was a logical deduction from the principles of the Reformation. You shall have a page from English History to show it. To protest against one authority, as not being divine, is to fall into the clutches of another, evidently human. Protestantism—let us repeat it, in no offensive sense, but historically, is a religious revolt. But, having revolted, you must either have anarchy, or, as members of a National Church, you become the

\* I think the historical phrase of that royal lady was: "I frocked you, and I can unfrock you."

ecclesiastical department of the Constitution;\* a stripe, so to say, of the English flag. Find a middle term, if you can. For instance: questions on doctrine arise; as in the now-forgotten Stone-altar case at Cambridge, or the Gorham question on baptism, or the Purchas case, or the presentment on the Crucifix at Folkstone. Who shall adjudicate? Convocation?† Convocation is summoned, or prorogued, or bidden not to meet, at the will of the Crown, that is, of the Prime Minister: and what are the discords of Convocation, when it is permitted to meet, I suppose are well known to you. Will you have the bench of bishops? I wonder how many of his right rev. brethren would endorse, for instance, these random sayings of Dr. Fraser. The decisions of the Universities? My own *Alma Mater* contains Dr. Pusey and Dr. Jowett, as the poles of a *cordon* of jarring oscillation. No: you must go straight to the head of your Church, for any decision on doctrine—at this present moment a very estimable and exemplary royal lady, heiress of the power which Henry VIII. assumed when he cast off that of Peter, and tried to grasp his keys. And even the Queen does not judge doctrinal matters in person. She hears by proxy; and that proxy her Council. A board of laymen and lawyers, of whom I will only say this: It would take a great act of faith, more than is ever required of a Catholic, to believe them personally infallible on faith, morals, or discipline.

\* Hume says, with amusing complacency, as a commentary on historical passages to be quoted below: "The acknowledgement of the King's Supremacy introduced *greater simplicity* in the government, by uniting the spiritual with the civil power, and preventing disputes about limits, which could never be exactly determined between the contending jurisdictions."

† This is the appeal of Mr. Ridsdale of Folkstone, even while these pages are being prepared for press. "Their opponents," he tells his congregation, "wished to do away with the doctrine of the Real Presence, and to do that, they attacked ceremonial. The State had no power over the Church's spiritual government. Convocation was the true government of the Church. They must defend at all costs the doctrine of the Real Presence. If it became necessary, it was the duty of the Church to defy the law of the land, etc." Many such words turn out to be not merely the cheap courage which has been exhibited in so many other occasions: and may the speaker learn, to his great gain, that the law of the land can most lawfully control the Church of the land—and of the landholders. If he seeks a Church that is really prepared to suffer rather than yield up the deposit of faith, he must go further, to fare better.

When Israel cried out to Samuel, in his old age : " Give us a King to judge us ; " the prophet forewarned them of the despotism they had chosen, in place of that theocracy by which the Lord Himself was their King. I should do great injustice to our fathers, the Englishmen of three centuries ago, if I imputed to *them* any desire of such a change. No ; it was the King himself, no Saint, within many degrees, who then made himself supreme head, and certainly ruled his Church with a rod of iron, and a whip of scorpions. If we would watch the process of turning a portion of the Catholic into a National Church, let us take it from the cold and dispassionate pages of Hume.

" A new session of Parliament was held (1531), together with a Convocation ; and the King here gave strong proofs of his extensive authority, as well as of his intention to turn it to the depression of the clergy. As an ancient statute, now almost obsolete, had been employed to ruin Wolsey, and render his exercise of the legatine power criminal, notwithstanding the King's permission, the same law was now turned against the ecclesiastics. It was pretended that every one who had submitted to the legatine court, that is, the whole Church [in England], had violated the statute of provisors ; and the Attorney-General accordingly brought an indictment against them. The Convocation knew that it would be in vain to oppose reason or equity to the King's arbitrary will, or plead that their ruin would have been the certain consequence of not submitting to Wolsey's commission, which was procured by Henry's consent, and supported by his authority. They chose, therefore, to throw themselves on the mercy of their Sovereign ; and they agreed to pay"—the Royal Supremacy, you will observe, lay very near to the Royal Exchequer—to pay " £118,840 for a pardon. A confession was likewise extorted from them, that the king was the Protector and the Supreme head of the Church and the clergy of England ; though some of them had the dexterity to get a clause inserted, which invalidated the whole submission, and ran in these terms : "*In so far as is permitted by the law of Christ.*" \*

The last words are significant: let us give them their due weight. They show that the limitations of the law

\* *History of England*, vol. iv., pp. 106, 107 (ed. 1739.)

of Christ forbade the acts of this new head of the Church, and "invalidated the whole submission" of the poor slaves whose consciences he was forcing. This, indeed, is plain enough. Let us see what happened three years after, in 1534. He had tasted the sweets of supremacy—supremacy! under the responsibility of which such men as St. Clement and St. Gregory feared and humbled themselves, while they exercised it. Henry had no such apprehensions of the account to be rendered. You need not be reminded, as matter of history (nor needed his subjects, before whose eyes the heads of all recalcitrants were fixed on poles upon London Bridge and Tower Hill), how cogent, how persuasive, were his arguments

But let us take another page from Hume:

"The King found his ecclesiastical subjects as compliant as the laity. The Convocation ordered that the Act against appeals to Rome" (remember St. Clement—'we should sin, if we deposed bishops who are blameless:' remember St. Gregory—'I know not what bishop is not subject to this See):—"together with the king's appeal to a General Council"—this appeal from a present, living authority to a future Council, has always been the stratagem of heresy, down to the Jansenists, down to our own day—"should be affixed to all the doors of all the churches in the kingdom. And they voted that the Bishop of Rome had by the law of God no more jurisdiction in England than any other foreign bishop."\*

How much did they leave to their Archbishop of Canterbury? King or Pope was the alternative; and like ancient Israel, they chose King.

"The bishops," I am almost ashamed to transcribe what follows—"went so far in their complaisance that they took out new commissions from the Crown, in which all their spiritual and episcopal authority was expressly affirmed to be derived ultimately from the civil magistrate, and to be entirely dependent on his good pleasure."†

It was at this juncture, this dark page of English history, that Fisher, the sainted Bishop of Rochester, lost his head on Tower Hill. He felt, like his great friend and fellow-martyr, Sir Thomas More, that in the Oath of Supremacy,

\* Ibid, p. 119

† Ibid. quoted from *Collier's Eccles. Hist.*, vol. ii.

there was "the jeopardy of the soul to perpetual damnation : " or, as the ex-Chancellor put it, trenchantly enough, "the difference standeth between beheading and hell." In November, the same year, "the Parliament, being again assembled, conferred on the King the title of the only Supreme head on earth of the Church of England ; " reasonably enough, on their own position ; because, having disallowed the appointment of God—"Thou art Cephas"—who else, I ask, could have been chosen for their new religion ? And, as Luther said, *Pecca fortiter* : if you will resist, and disown, and disclaim, what the Most High has appointed—but let us turn to Hume again.

"In this memorable Act, the Parliament granted him power, or rather acknowledged his inherent power, 'to visit, and repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain, or amend all errors, heresies, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities, which fell under any spiritual authority or jurisdiction.' " \*

And such was the birth and cradle of the Church of England ; that National, Protestant, and (by some of its members styled) Anglo-Catholic religion, which has no true sympathy with any other existing body of religionists on earth ; too prelatie for some, too Protestant for others ; not high Lutheran, because it does not hold Consubstantiation ; not low Lutheran, because of its bishops, with the high-sounding titles to their ancient sees ; not Calvinistic, though in its articles patient of mitigated Calvinism ; not Catholic, from all that you have heard to night of its history, tenor, and first principle of existence ; too negative to excite enthusiasm, too worldly-respectable to provoke sheer contempt ; modified by successive Sovereigns and Convocations, from Elizabeth to Charles II. ; blown about with every wind of doctrine, turning, like the courtly sunflower to the royal sun ; too feeble to eject such pastors as authors of "Essays and Reviews ; " enlarging its comprehensiveness while it dwindles in truth ; giving up doctrine, to accept royal decisions through courts of law ; propounding platitudes, content with generalities, patient of infidelities—why, I stumble, almost unaware, on St. Leo's immortal saying, about the *Catholicity* (let us just once abuse the term) of ancient Rome, that Babylon on seven hills, that

\* Ibid. p. 120. Burnet, vol. i., p. 156.

great opponent, in her days, of the Church of God, who *magnam sibi visa est assumpsisse religionem, quia nullam respuebat falsitatem* :\* deemed forsooth, she had adopted a large amount of religious truth, because she rejected no religious falsehood.

To sum up, then, I conclude (1) if a Church is National, that Church prefers setting up for itself rather than belong to the universal family, and so of necessity forfeits its claim to be Catholic; (2) if a Church is Protestant, it is so as having protested against the rest, and severed itself from the rest; (3) if a Church is not Catholic, it is not the Church of our Blessed Lord, nor the Church of the Bible, nor the Church of the tradition of eighteen centuries, nor the Church of any sound reason, nor any intelligible theory, nor of any successful precedent; nor a Church that can do the Lord's work in any land, nor save the souls that trust to it, though it may have station, the venerableness of three centuries, and all the wealth and appliances it has pillaged from the rightful owner, or accepted from its royal head; (4) finally, a supposed Church, which should unite the incompatible elements designated by the three terms of Dr Fraser's grouping, would be a monster of hideousness if were not an impossibility: and, therefore, terrified under the impression of such a nightmare, we may be thankful on waking to find it—as its exhibitor and patron has described it to be—a *dream*.

And now, I will venture on a parting word of advice. It may never reach the person chiefly concerned, whose random utterances on subjects of which (I must be allowed to say) he knows so little, have afforded the texts for these considerations. But my words will reach others, for whose salvation I would willingly lay down my life; some of whom, it cannot be doubted, belong to the established religion of the country, and therefore consider themselves under this prelate's guidance. For their sakes I say it, and for those whom they may influence in turn.

The Protestant Bishop of Manchester, then, has made, I think, a mistake. He has thrown down his gauntlet on the arena of Christian antiquity. His "fearless" utterances, as he well calls them, are like all unhesitating statements until they are sifted; they have an engaging, taking air.

\* Serm. I. in Nativitate S.S. Pet. et Pauli.

"One story is good," sometimes very good, "till another is told." In this world of conflict and uncertainty, it is so satisfactory to have a man come forward and say: I assure you, I am right: this or that defence of our position may be fearlessly announced and fearlessly accepted. No wonder, nine-tenths of men are ready to acquiesce in such unhesitating assurance, without further research. But, in proportion to the flattering unction of the delusion, is the disappointment of the discovery. The mirage vanishes, and leaves the wanderer thirstier than before. Thus, St. Clement and St. Gregory, so confidently referred to as negative on Catholic doctrine, or bulwarks of Anglicanism, turn out to be very pillars of the Papacy. And what, then, becomes of the credit of the exhibitor in this phantasmagoria, who has put the wrong slide into his magic-lantern?

Every man is responsible for his words; a public man, beyond others, for his public utterances; most of all, a man supposed to be invested with a sacred character, for his discourses. If he assures us of a thing deeply affecting our best interests, and it turns out to be the reverse, before what tribunal shall we bring him? He is, indeed, amenable to his Creator; but on that part of the subject I do not, and dare not, dwell. "Every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give an account of it in the Day of Judgment." My point is, he is amenable to public opinion: to that we hold him. He has told you publicly, and assured you "fearlessly," that St. Clement had nothing in his writings distinctive "Roman;" and in his writings, though their purpose is foreign to these subjects, you have seen, to waive other points, confession, the holy Sacrifice, and the claim to depose the bishops of other Churches. You have found, unmistakably, the Papacy. He then quoted to you, with the same publicity, and the same recklessness, words of St. Gregory, as bearing a conclusion, which I have shown they are far from bearing: words which he ought to have known had been expounded, countless times, in the genuine sense which other words of the holy writer assign to them. Lastly he detailed to you his dream—a dream more obscure than that of Pharaoh's chief butler, which I will not pretend to interpret as being consistent, rational, or possible.

These, I say, are grave mistakes, to speak gently of them.

He should have ascertained in his study what would be safe to assert in the pulpit. A great Anglican authority, Bishop Butler, has said of those who are inaccurate speakers because they are inconsequent thinkers, that they "come abroad in a disorder which they ought to be under some concern at finding themselves in at home." I cannot exempt our right rev. opponent from this class of men. If such are the utterances of those gentlemen, who, at a vast expense, are maintained to teach truth to our fellow-countrymen, it certainly throws some light on the question: "Is the Church of England worth preserving?" If it is worth preserving, it might be worth amending in some points. There would be no disadvantage in its taking one leaf out of the Papal book. We find the benefit every day of that appeal to Rome which gives us the blessing of a final authority. The utterances of all the Church's children, of whatever station or learning, whether teachers or taught, may be reviewed by the Holy See. If some parallel institution existed in the established Church of this country, I cannot but think it would be more for the comfort for its members, ay, and for the credit of its bishops. You would not then be distressed, my non-Catholic readers, by crude and baseless words, which a breath can overturn. Depend upon it, a headless community is an uncomfortable thing to belong to. There is a divine wisdom shown in the appointment of one who here upon earth shall represent the authority and the infallibility of Him who reigns above, the Eternal Wisdom, the Infinite Supremacy. It would be a boon the established religion never has merited, and never will possess; "a bishop of bishops" to have recourse to, and a "pastor of pastors," when inferior bishops and pastors commit their co-religionists, as far as they personally can, to statements and dreams like those we have here reviewed. Such a bishop of bishops would not be a forerunner of Antichrist. He would be a harbinger of something intellectually respectable. And thus, out of Dr. Fraser's mouth, I deduce a powerful argument for the Papacy.

We may see also a further inference from what has been before us. If the only defence of the Anglican belief lies, thus confessedly, in antiquity misunderstood, and misquoted, then have we gained no small point in our endeavours to convert "men of good will" to the one Faith, ancient and



true. The bishop may be quite exonerated from any intentional misleading. He is, perhaps, too busy a man to go adequately into his subject. He is asked to preach a sermon, and takes up the first topic that comes to hand. It is the opening of St. Clement's Church. What more natural than to assert, and to assert "fearlessly"—because what is worth doing at all, is worth doing well—that St. Clement was a good Protestant? That will please his audience, and he knows no reason to the contrary. Then, having his hand in, he goes on to St. Gregory; because he has heard certain words quoted again and again, and he believes in the Protestant misconstruction of them, having never read the counter passages, nor weighed the context.

This is random work: it is not calculated to inspire confidence in any teacher. And, if it be answered, that, after all, no such great harm was meant; why, that is the excuse of all idle people who throw stones at their neighbours' windows. If not much was meant, and he had no malice, he ought to have thought twice before he preached what he cannot justify. Let it be a lesson for another time. Had I the opportunity, I would remind him of a passage in the life of Lord Chatham, not more applicable to a lay lord than to a spiritual peer. An opponent of Chatham's, in the Upper House, after an untenable speech, and on being brought to book for it, stammered out that, really, he had *meant* nothing. "Then," said Chatham, in his severest manner, "let me recommend the noble lord, the next time he *means* nothing—TO SAY NOTHING.

W. H. A.

*Church of the Holy Name, Manchester,  
Lent, 1876.*







